



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2006

No. 81

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Father Luke Palumbis, St. Basil Greek Orthodox Church, Stockton, CA, offered the following prayer:

Lord, have mercy. Heavenly Father, through Your love for all of Your creation and Your consummatory divine plan, You have established a natural, communal existence which symbiotically maintains fairness, serenity, shared support, concern for holistic well-being, and license from imposed control.

We thank You, Loving Master, that in accordance with this perfect model of Your creation, our Founding Fathers established a foundation for the formation of what they termed a more perfect Union through the establishment of justice, the ensuring of domestic tranquility, the providing for common defense, the promoting of general welfare, and the securing of the blessings of liberty.

We beseech You, All Holy One, to strengthen our civic leaders and our entire population of America with the virtues of humility, courage, and perseverance so that today we may actualize the poetic words of our Constitution not only as United States, but as united individual Americans, living in the union of God's creation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GINGREY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

DEMOCRATS STILL NEED TO DECIDE WHERE THEY STAND ON WAR ON TERROR

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week the House voted to pass a resolution declaring that the United States will prevail in the global war on terror. The House spent 10 hours debating the measure, which came on the heels of two victories, the formation of the Iraqi Government and the death of Abu Musab al Zarqawi.

House Republicans made clear that we are determined to prevail in protecting our freedoms from the terrorists, but House Democrats couldn't even develop a unified message to let the American people know where they stand on the global war on terror. While House Republicans stood firmly in support behind our troops, House Democrats were all over the place. The San Diego Union Tribune reported on this confusion by saying, "Some Democrats stand with the White House, some change their views day to day, some incredibly don't believe Iraq has much to do with the war on terrorism. They seem to want Iraq to collapse in civil war rather than have any sort of resolution that can be seen as vindication of U.S. foreign policy."

Mr. Speaker, the American people have a clear choice: House Republicans are committed to winning this global war on terror, while House Democrats seem to want to give up and concede defeat.

BLACK ROBE DISEASE

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, judicial injustice has struck again. That is what has happened in Ohio.

After 6 years of waiting to face the man who raped her and tell her horror at his hands so he would be off the streets, a teen saw her chances for justice smashed with one swoop of a rogue judge's gavel. It was nothing the victim did; it wasn't even anything the defendant did. Judge Eileen Gallagher dismissed the girl's case, get this, because the prosecutor was late to court. Furious he hadn't been on time when she herself was 45 minutes late to her own court, Judge Gallagher called the prosecutor unprofessional, so she took it out on the victim.

Judge Gallagher suffers from "black robe disease," an incurable ailment, arrogant, hypocritical incompetence some judges get.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a judge in Texas for 22 years, and a lawyer was late to court, hold the lawyer in contempt, put him in jail. Don't let the defendant out of jail. Don't punish the victim.

The teen victim was raped by the defendant, then raped by her right to justice by Judge Gallagher. Hopefully the people of Ohio will hold this judge in contempt and dismiss her from the bench.

That's just the way it is.

A CALL FOR A NEW DIPLOMACY

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, if you had a friend who anytime he took the car out for a drive got in a wreck, if you really cared about your friend and others, you would take away the car

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4331

keys. Nearly every time this administration takes the U.S. for a drive out in the world, it crashes the car. Look at Iraq: no diplomacy, confrontation, attack, occupation. Iran: no diplomacy, confrontation. North Korea: no diplomacy, threats, confrontation, even when they are preparing a missile test.

Instead of a national missile defense system which doesn't work protecting us against a North Korea missile of dubious accuracy, we should look at talking with them. North Korea wants direct talks. Well, talk to them. Don't crash the car.

America must be able to negotiate in a complex world without confrontation and creating enemies. You are either with us or against us or bring it on? That is not a path towards successful diplomacy.

There is a basic flaw in America's world view and this administration's world view. This, then, is a call for a new diplomacy, policies where we look at potential adversaries as potential allies, and then acting upon that vision.

IMMIGRATION AND BORDER SECURITY

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, the more people learn about TED KENNEDY's immigration bill, the less they like it. Let me give you four examples.

First, before we build a border security fence on our own U.S. property, we must first consult with the Mexican Government to make sure it is okay with them.

Second, using a fake Social Security card is a felony in this country. If an American citizen does it, he goes to jail. If an illegal alien does it, he gets to collect Social Security benefits based on past illegal conduct, and even gets a chance at citizenship.

Third, when it comes to in-state college tuition, illegal aliens get it, but U.S. citizens from out of State pay higher tuition rates.

Fourth, illegals who become so-called guest workers would get the higher union-level prevailing wage on private construction contracts, something even U.S. citizens don't get.

Mr. Speaker, we should first secure our borders and enforce the law, not appease the liberal constituency of TED KENNEDY by accepting his pathetic bill.

DEMOCRATS REFUSE TO IGNORE THE NEEDS OF LOW-INCOME AMERICANS

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, this week was supposed to finally have a vote on increasing the minimum wage for more than 7 million Americans. Unfortunately, it appears the Republican leadership is willing to delay a vote on the must-pass Labor-HHS appropria-

tions bill rather than actually have a real floor debate and a vote on the minimum wage.

This is a real disservice to every American. An increase in the minimum wage does not only benefit the minimum-wage workers, it also helps millions of middle-class workers who would also see their hourly wages increase as a result of a higher minimum wage.

But this is also a question of fairness. It has been 9 years since the minimum-wage workers last received a pay raise. Does that sound fair? Today the minimum wage is its lowest level if you take into account inflation. Do my Republican colleagues really believe that we should continue to force more than 7 million Americans to live on less than \$11,000 a year? That may have been a liveable wage 10 years ago, but it surely isn't now. We should do the right thing and expand economic opportunity to millions of Americans who are just trying to make a living wage.

MS-13 AND IMMIGRATION

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, crime by illegal immigrant members of criminal street gangs is exploding. Immigration and Custom Enforcement has stated, "The victims of gang crime are not limited to rival gang members. Entire neighborhoods are held hostage by and subjected to the violence of street gangs."

Currently alien members of criminal street gangs are not deportable. Many of the U.S. members of one of the international criminal gangs are present here under temporary protective status. MS-13 originated in El Salvador, complicating detention and deportation. A 1988 Ninth Circuit Federal Court injunction prevents expedited removal of Salvadorans due to a vicious civil war in this country. That civil war ended in 1992, and the injunction still remains. As a result, captured El Salvadorans are immediately released. In 2005, 40,000 Salvadoran illegals were apprehended. However, we currently estimated that for each individual caught, five cross our borders successfully.

SLOGANS DO NOT REPLACE SOLUTIONS

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing we have learned from the Republican Congress in the last 6 years, it is that slogans do not replace solutions. On America's most pressing issues, they have failed to act, and on others they demonstrated an uncanny Midas touch.

Take the \$800 billion prescription drug benefit. Rather than reducing

costs for seniors, it is nothing more than an ATM machine for HMOs and drug companies. Two studies released yesterday show that the prices of medicines used by seniors are rising twice the rate of inflation. Consider the energy bill. In June 2005, a month before the bill passed, gas was \$2.07; today, it is more than \$3.

On immigration, the House Republicans have sent up a white flag, an issue which they have ignored for 6 years. They offer more talk, less action. They won't pass a bill. They want a single-issue election on something they haven't done a single thing on.

Even yesterday's conviction of the Bush administration chief procurement officer for influence peddling won't shame them into passing real lobbying or ethics reform. They deny an increase in the minimum wage and a vote on that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, one thing is clear: When it comes to addressing the issues important to American families, the Republican Congress is all hat and no cattle. It is time for a new direction. It is time for a change.

DEM AGENDA

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Doomsday. That is what the Democrats have to offer. But, actually, we have been waiting for weeks, months, actually over a year now for the Democrats to offer an agenda, and they did that last week, although agenda may be a little too strong of a word. It should be more appropriately called the Cliff Notes for Liberal Lunacy.

Case in point. They say they need to require fiscal discipline. Is this some kind of joke coming from the Dems? This is the same party that has proposed \$45 billion in new spending on this House floor to appropriations bills over and above what we as Republicans want to fund.

Where do Democrats propose eliminating the deficit, by cutting the size of growth? Do they do that? No. They actually just want to go back to raising your taxes for all hardworking Americans.

The Democrats are calling from the same old playbook: Promise, tax, spend. Promise, tax, spend. And what we have with their agenda is more of the same.

□ 1015

LINE ITEM VETO IS NOTHING BUT DIVERSION

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are going to try to demonstrate that they are serious about reversing the record deficits that they have created. What is their plan?

They want to give President Bush a line item veto. Incredible.

If the President was really interested in curbing Federal expenditures, he could have vetoed any number of appropriations bills over the last 5 years. To this date, Mr. Speaker, the President has not vetoed one bill that has come out of this Republican Congress, not one. President Bush is the longest sitting President since Thomas Jefferson not to exercise the veto.

So one might ask, why does the President need a line item veto when he refuses to use the veto? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this is nothing more than a smokescreen invented by the Republicans to show that they are serious about deficit reduction.

They are trying to divert attention away from the fact that under their control record surpluses have turned into record deficits. If President Bush really wanted to exercise discipline, he would have vetoed other legislation.

IRAQ

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the impressive work our troops are doing to fight and win the global war on terror.

Last week, we debated a resolution pledging our commitment to victory in Iraq. I was troubled by some of the rhetoric I heard coming from other side of the aisle. Many Democrats are still advocating a withdrawal policy, and that is a policy that is sure to fail.

Mr. Speaker, we are making significant strides toward a secure Iraq and a more stable Middle East. At that critical moment, it would be a tremendous mistake for us to set a hard deadline for troop withdrawal. A deadline only serves to embolden the terrorists because they know they only have to hold out for a few more weeks or months, or 6 months.

Instead, the House last week sent a resounding message to al Qaeda that we will withdraw when the Iraqi security forces are ready and able to defeat the terrorists and their brutal tactics. This, and not some arbitrary deadline, is our true measure of success.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we have assured our troops that we will support them and will allow them to finish this critical mission.

REPUBLICANS STALL BILL THAT WOULD BOOST SALARIES

(Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, workers across this Nation are increasingly being asked to do more with less. As prices rise at the gas pump, at pharmacies, on college loans, the millions of Americans who work full-time and make minimum wage are slipping further and further into poverty.

The minimum wage in this country has not been raised since 1997 and is now at its lowest level in 50 years, when adjusted for inflation. Making only \$5.15 an hour, a full-time, minimum wage employee will earn only \$10,700 annually. This is far from enough to make ends meet, especially for the 75 percent or so who are responsible for at least half of their family's income. Raising children on a middle-class income is hard enough. Imagine trying to do it on less than a third of that.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats believe that the minimum wage should be a living wage. No American who works full-time, all year, should live in poverty, unable to support their family. Last week at the committee level, Democrats were successful in inserting a minimum wage increase into an appropriations bill. But now, the Republican leadership says they will not permit a vote on the minimum wage. They will not permit a vote in this full House.

It is time for real action to move hardworking Americans out of poverty. Seven million Americans deserve a raise today.

WHERE IS THE OUTRAGE?

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, where is the outrage? We hear stories today of two of our soldiers having suffered unspeakable tortures and left in a nearly unrecognizable condition, yet where are the cries of outrage against this brutality?

Instead, we hear today of the EU leadership focused on closing Gitmo and Members of this body rushing to judgment on national TV before the facts are known about what our troops in the field have done.

Yes, we should hold our troops to the highest ethical standards, but we must be outraged by acts against our troops. Our troops deserve our full support, and we must recognize the intensity of evil that we face, the lengths they will go to harm America and undermine our values, and the need to make sure we win this war on terror to keep our families safe at home.

HONORING ALBERT HILL ODOM

(Mr. BOYD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and pay tribute to Mr. Albert Hill Odom, a good friend and a loving husband and father, who passed away on June 6, 2006, at the age of 87.

Mr. Odom was a great man who positively impacted many young lives, including my own. Mr. Odom was a 4-H extension agent for 30 years in Jefferson County, Florida. He taught me and many others so much, not only about the principles of 4-H, but also how to

conduct ourselves in a respectful and professional way. We were all young farm boys whom he carried to places we had never been before.

I am often asked who the most influential people in my life have been, and my answer is always, first, my father, then Albert Odom, my 4-H agent. A lifelong mentor and role model, Albert Odom was a wonderful man who left the world a better place than he found it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Albert Odom for his many achievements in life and the legacy that he leaves. I extend my deepest sympathy to the Odom family, including his wife, Dot, and his children, Carol and Martha. He will be greatly missed by his family and all who knew him.

STATE CHAMPS—LASSITER AND BLESSED TRINITY

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly rise to honor and congratulate some spectacular student athletes from Georgia's Sixth District. This month, two of our hometown high schools won a State baseball championship.

Marietta's Lassiter High School and Roswell's Blessed Trinity High both took home their respective class' State championship in dominating fashion. These skilled young men showed what is possible with hard work and unending determination.

Lassiter took home the school's second State title after beating another Sixth District team, Kell High School. The Trojans ended their season with 19 straight wins, sweeping every round of the playoffs.

Blessed Trinity amazed everyone with their ascendancy to the State title in only 6 years of existence. Similar to Lassiter, the Titans went through the playoffs losing only one game and sweeping four out of five series.

These student athletes will forever cherish the memory of this season. The players, their families, and their classmates who cheered them on will always look back at the 2006 season as a source of pride, accomplishment and satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations to all from Lassiter and Blessed Trinity High Schools.

A PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT THAT PUTS SENIORS FIRST

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats continue the fight for a real prescription drug benefit that puts America's seniors first. There is no doubt that the current prescription drug program could be improved.

Today, the Department of Veterans Affairs is saving millions of dollars a year simply by negotiating drug prices on behalf of our country's veterans. Just imagine how much more affordable drugs would be if the Federal Government could negotiate for lower prices on behalf of our country's 40 million seniors.

Seniors who need help affording their monthly prescription drug bills deserve to be heard.

House Democrats not only support requiring Medicare to negotiate lower prices with the drug companies, we also favor allowing for the safe reimportation of less expensive drugs from abroad. These are real solutions. Let us finally put our seniors first and help them afford their prescription drugs.

HELPING AMERICAN SENIORS MAINTAIN INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Census Bureau estimates that more than 36 million Americans are over the age of 65, making them members of the fastest growing age group in our country. Under the able leadership of Chairman BUCK MCKEON, House Republicans are working to ensure the quality and effectiveness of Federal programs designed to help America's elderly.

Today, I am proud to speak in support of the Senior Independence Act of 2006, which proposes several necessary reforms to help older individuals avoid institutional care, improve their health services, and have access to employment-based training programs. By reviewing and modernizing programs established over 50 years ago, we are helping to ensure that America's government programs actually address the needs of today's seniors.

This bill will help ensure America's seniors live healthier and happier lives.

In conclusion, our sympathies are with the families of Private Thomas Tucker and Private Kristian Menchaca. God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

WE NEED A LIVABLE WAGE

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, somebody asked me the other day how do you strengthen the economy, and I said to them that you strengthen it by putting additional money into the hands and the pockets of those at the economic bottom. If they get an additional dollar or two, what are they going to do with it? They are going to buy milk, Cream of Wheat, oatmeal, pay the utility bill, maybe some gasoline for an automobile, if they still

have one. They will put it right back into the economy.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we need a livable wage. Money to the economy is like blood to the body. If too much of it is on one side, you will have a stroke. Our economy has a stroke because too much of the money is in the hands of too few people. We need a livable wage.

WE MADE THE RIGHT DECISION

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, for decades, America and free countries in Europe, Africa and Southeast Asia have been the targets of terrorism, terrorism that originated in the Middle East and has been if not openly supported by countries there then at the very least overlooked by these nations.

On September 11, we decided that periodic attacks like the bombing of the Pan Am Flight 103, the USS *Cole*, Khobar Towers, the first World Trade Center bombing, we decided that that had to stop. We decided the only way to end these attacks was going into the Middle East and let it be known that we would no longer tolerate regimes that encouraged terrorism and shunned the rules most in the civilized world choose to abide by.

That was the right decision then. It remains the right decision today.

DEMOCRATS WORKING TO EXPAND OPPORTUNITY TO MINIMUM WAGE WORKERS

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats want to give minimum-wage workers their first pay raise in 9 years. Can you imagine working 9 years and never have a pay raise? Gas went up, milk went up, housing went up, electricity went up, and the House Republicans are doing everything they can to avoid the issue.

Last week, seven Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee voted with Democrats to increase the minimum wage from \$5.15 to \$7.25 as part of the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, but now the leaders of the Republican Party refuse to bring this bill to the floor, hoping they can skirt the issue until after election.

Can you imagine if you had to wait till after an election to get some more money to buy that gas that is \$3 a gallon?

The Republican leaders must have done a lot of arm twisting over the weekend because when Democrats called for an increase in the minimum wage on another appropriations bill yesterday, not one of those seven who were with us last week, who had the guts to be with us last week, were with us yesterday.

I just cannot understand why the House Republicans refuse to allow a floor vote on minimum wage. They will not do it because they know the American people will not vote for them if they do not increase the rate.

SENIOR INDEPENDENCE ACT

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to commend Chairman MCKEON of the Energy and Workforce Committee and Congressman TIBERI, who chairs the relevant subcommittee of that committee.

Today, we are going to discuss on suspension a bill that they have created, the Senior Independence Act, which is the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act. They have done excellent work, and I also want to thank Congressman DANNY DAVIS, who has worked with me and I have worked with him to make certain that we also address mental health issues in this bill.

Last winter, I had the pleasure of meeting Suzann Ogland-Hand, who is one of my constituents, and whom I nominated for the White House Conference on Aging. She is a mental health expert, and she helps large numbers of elderly people deal with their mental health problems.

Clearly, this is an issue whose time has come, and I am very pleased that the bill we will be taking up today under suspension includes provisions that will take care of the mental health needs of so many Americans, large and small, and deal with all the different issues that the elderly face.

I commend, again, Mr. MCKEON for bringing this bill to the floor.

□ 1030

WHAT A DIFFERENCE A WEEK MAKES

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite scriptures is, "Let the work I have done speak for me." Mr. Speaker, what a difference a week makes. Last week seven House Republicans joined Democrats in supporting an increase in the minimum wage. Yesterday, when the measure came up in another appropriation bill, they certainly changed their minds and joined the rest of the Republicans in ignoring the needs of 7 million hard-working minimum-wage workers, which begs the question: What exactly happened over the last 7 days to make those seven Republicans change their minds?

They certainly didn't spend any time with minimum-wage workers, otherwise they would have heard how the

workers can barely make ends meet, considering that those who work have to work an entire 8-hour shift just to fill up their gas tank, if they are lucky enough to have a car. In the wealthiest country in the world, this is not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats want to expand economic opportunities for 7 million Americans. Let the work we do make a difference for the working men and women in this country.

DEMOCRATS ATTEMPTING TO INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, over the past 5 years, average, hardworking Americans have been ignored by the Republicans in Washington. While House Republicans have been showering their corporate interest friends with tons of tax breaks, they have refused for 9 years, for 9 years, to bring to the floor a vote to increase the minimum wage. It is time that this Congress gave 7 million people across the United States a raise.

Last week the Democrats were successful in adding a minimum wage to the labor appropriation bill, and it was supposed to be on the floor this week, but the House leadership refuses to bring it up. They want to bring it up after the elections. Why would that be? They are afraid if they vote against it, which they need to vote against the minimum wage, the rest of you Americans won't vote for them. So they are going to wait until after the election.

The American people should know that House Democrats are not running away from this issue. In fact, increasing the minimum wage is one of our top priorities.

LINE ITEM VETO WON'T BALANCE BUDGET

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, over the next couple of days we are going to hear a lot from House Republicans about how they are finally being fiscally responsible by giving the President a line item veto. The House Republicans are kidding themselves if they believe this will reverse the fiscal collapse they have presided over the last 5 years.

If House Republicans were really interested in restoring fiscal discipline here in Washington, they would have adopted a 2007 budget that actually balanced the budget in the coming years. Instead, the House Republican budget actually makes the deficit worse, offers no plan to bring the budget back in balance, and adds to the growing burden of the national debt. Thanks to these Republican budgets,

the five largest deficits in history will have occurred in these last 5 consecutive years.

Giving President Bush a line item veto will not change the course. Instead, we need to go in a new direction. House Democrats offered an alternative that balanced the Federal budget by 2012. Our proposal also restored pay-as-you-go rules that were so successful in turning deficits into surpluses in the 1990s. Democrats offered a fiscally sound plan, but Republicans rejected it.

So much for Republican fiscal discipline.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

AMENDING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5060) to amend the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 to require data with respect to Federal financial assistance to be available for public access in a searchable and user friendly form, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5060

Be in enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DATA WITH RESPECT TO FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE REQUIRED TO BE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC ACCESS IN SEARCHABLE AND USER-FRIENDLY FORM.

(a) DATA REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, as part of the implementation of the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-107; 31 U.S.C. 6101 note), work with the Administrator of General Services and other agencies to make available data with respect to Federal financial assistance in accordance with this section and section 204 of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note).

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The Director shall ensure that the data required under subsection (a), at a minimum—

(1) are available on the Internet, from a single website database, at no cost to the public;

(2) contain—

(A) all information and types of information (in this section referred to as “data fields”) collected through the Federal Assistance Award Data System, Grants.gov, or any other existing Federal database; and

(B) additional information about each Federal financial assistance award, including program source or funding authority, statu-

tory or regulatory authority, renewability, number of applicants and recipients, type of activity being performed, required measurable outcomes, and any other relevant information;

(3) are in a form that allows for full searching and aggregation of all data fields across all agencies;

(4) include information about Federal financial assistance awards within 30 days after award of the assistance;

(5) identify the Federal financial assistance that a recipient has received during the preceding 10-year period, including an itemized breakdown of that assistance by agency and program source;

(6) include lists of Federal financial assistance awards and the dates and amounts of Federal fund disbursements; and

(7) identify subgrantees that are non-Federal entities.

(c) DOWNLOAD ABILITY.—The Director also shall ensure that the website containing the data allows for the public to download—

(1) results of searches; and

(2) the entire database on a quarterly basis.

(d) PERIOD COVERED.—For purposes of subsection (b)(5), the first 10-year period to be covered shall begin with the year 2006.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) The term “Federal financial assistance” has the same meaning as defined in section 7501(a)(5) of title 31, United States Code, except that, in applying such definition, the term “non-Federal entity” has the meaning provided in paragraph (2).

(2) The term “non-Federal entity” means a State, local government, nonprofit organization, corporation, association, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or any other legal business entity.

(f) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—The website database made available pursuant to this section shall not be considered in compliance with this section if it only provides electronic links to the Federal Assistance Award Data System, Grants.gov, or other existing websites and databases, unless each of those sites has information from all agencies and meets the requirements of subsections (b) and (c).

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The data shall be available for public use not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Majority Whip Roy BLUNT and I introduced H.R. 5060, which would amend the Federal Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 to require data with respect to Federal financial assistance to be

available for public access in a searchable and user-friendly form. The bill would require the Office of Management and Budget to create a Web site for all grant awards to be displayed in a format that would be easily accessible and free of charge. Each award would be required to be listed on the Web site within 30 days of its enactment.

No such real-time disclosure is required today of grant awards, and available data is often untimely. Currently there is no central database of all entities receiving Federal funds, including the nearly 30,000 organizations that are awarded nearly \$300 billion in Federal grants each year. In fact, several agencies have taken different approaches to making public information about grantees, and often little or no information is available on line.

Our bill would put the framework in place for increased sunshine on the Federal grant process, allowing anyone with access to the Internet to review and search Federal assistance awards, thus providing greater transparency to the grant-making process.

I congratulate my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, for recognizing the importance of this issue and working so hard to bring this measure forward. I also want to thank my ranking member Mr. WAXMAN for working to move this legislation forward in a bipartisan way. This bill adds much-needed transparency to the Federal grant process. I also want to thank Mr. DAVIS, too, my colleague from Illinois, for his assistance in this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the chairman of the Government Reform Committee, Chairman DAVIS, in consideration of H.R. 5060, which calls for the creation of a new searchable database of all Federal grants to be made publicly available on the Internet.

I have always had serious concerns about any decision to bring a bill to the floor without the opportunity for hearings or other committee consideration, but I have been very pleased with Majority Whip BLUNT and Chairman DAVIS' willingness to work together over the past week to address problems with the bill and to make revisions.

As revised, the bill will require the Office of Management and Budget to develop a database that would be useful to individuals and organizations researching Federal grant funding. The database will provide a complete record of Federal grant funding, including information about grantees and the purpose and requirements of each grant. The requirement that the database be fully searchable and available for download is also most important.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to increase public under-

standing of Federal spending and public access to information about how taxpayer dollars are spent. Currently the public has access to a data system, the Federal Assistance Award Data System, that provides limited information about domestic grants, but this system is unwieldy and difficult to use. Under this bill public oversight of Federal spending will increase.

The bill is a step in the right direction, but it is missing a key component that is essential to public oversight. I had hoped that the legislation we are considering today would have required that information on Federal contracts be included in the database or in a similar separate database of Federal contracts. As Federal contract spending increases, there is a vital need for the public to be able to track and understand this spending.

As with the Federal Assistance Award Data System for grants, there is a publicly available database of contracts, the Federal Procurement Data System, but it, too, is plagued with problems. This data system is often incomplete, and, like the grant data system, is unwieldy and difficult to use. Currently it is virtually impossible for the public to accurately track Federal contract spending.

I understand that Chairman DAVIS has agreed to work on improving the FPDS with Ranking Member WAXMAN and others in order to make Federal contract information freely and easily accessible to the public. I, quite frankly, look forward to this collaboration, and I hope that when the new database of Federal grants is made available on a Web site for the public to search and download at no charge, there will also be a new FPDS system or other new contracts database made available that is just as accessible and usable as the new grants database that we are dealing with.

I want to again commend the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and its ranking member, Mr. WAXMAN, for the tremendous leadership that they both provide in a very bipartisan way. I think that is one of the reasons that you see us down here so often with bills that have come through that committee ready for passage on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his kind words and also thank him for his many, many contributions to the committee and the bipartisan approach we have taken to issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), who is the chief author of this legislation.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the chairman for yielding, Mr. Speaker, and I also thank Mr. DAVIS for his generous comments and his hard work on this bill.

Over the past several months, Mr. Speaker, we have had good discussions

in the House about earmarks and earmark reform. The House has committed to pass and will pass earmark reform to increase sunshine on the earmark process, yet there is another process in the Federal Government that, despite spending over \$300 billion a year, has almost no disclosure. That is really the purpose of this bill.

Each year the Federal Government gives out thousands of grants to various organizations and entities. All told, about 30,000 organizations a year receive grants, yet there is no central system available to the public or even to the Congress to determine who is receiving these taxpayer funds and how they are being spent.

Chairman DAVIS and I have introduced H.R. 5060, the bill we are considering today, to correct this. This legislation requires the Office of Management and Budget to establish a searchable public Web site listing all recipients of Federal financial assistance, such as grants and loans. Within 30 days of a grant award, the following information would be available to the public through this single site on the Internet and should be and would be required by law to be easily searchable:

There would be the name of the grantee and the subgrantees who have received the award; an itemized breakdown of that assistance by agency and program source; and all of the grants that the grantee has received in the past 10 years.

This database will serve as an invaluable tool enabling Congress, the public, and the media to easily determine who is receiving taxpayer funds. This information will be critical in uncovering wasteful spending and ensuring compliance with existing Federal laws, including the 1995 Lobbying Disclosure Act.

There are numerous examples of wasteful government grants, such as millions of dollars spent by the National Institute of Mental Health to study what makes a meaningful day for college students or to study how college students decorate their dorm rooms.

□ 1045

I was a college president for 4 years, and I will tell you that is a study that is not only not worth having, but something that nobody wants to know about.

Often such waste has been uncovered by the inspector general from the various agencies, such as an effort made by the inspector general in 2003 that resulted in an EPA grant from the 1990s, where \$700,000 was spent, was granted, without any knowledge of what work the recipient was going to perform. Under this law, that information will become publicly and quickly available.

This bill will empower everybody with access to the Internet to begin reviewing Federal grants and other forms of taxpayer assistance to look for such waste, fraud and abuse. This, in turn, will help us become better stewards of taxpayer funds.

This legislation will also help to ensure that Federal laws are adhered to by those receiving Federal funds. Frequently, Federal law imposes various restrictions or requirements on Federal grantees. For example, Congress has required that entities receiving funds under our global AIDS programs have a firm policy opposing prostitution and sex trafficking. Yet last year, the Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources uncovered that a USAID grantee was subgranting taxpayer funds to an organization that was pro-prostitution. This bill requires grantees to also disclose their subgrantees, thus making it easier to ensure compliance with important Federal policies like those that would be applicable to this and other funds.

This legislation will also ensure compliance with existing lobbying restrictions. The 1995 Lobbying Disclosure Act prohibits organizations that receive Federal grants from lobbying, even with their own funds. The restriction has been difficult to enforce. This access to information about who gets grants makes it easier to see that the lobbying bill itself is enforced.

It is my belief that this bill will provide important information to all Americans and serve as a powerful tool to improve how the government spends precious taxpayer funds.

I want to thank Chairman DAVIS and ranking member WAXMAN for their assistance in moving this legislation forward. And in particular, I want to thank the staff of the Committee on Government Reform, particularly Ellen Brown, Mason Alinger, and Ed Puccarella for their tremendous efforts to help my staff with this bill and to improve the bill as it moved through the committee. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Branson for yielding, and I rise in strong support of this legislation.

As my colleague knows, we have been focusing on the issue of accountability, transparency and greater disclosure as we look at the challenge of trying to put into place lobby and ethics reform which passed in this House with bipartisan support. We are still working with the Senate on that.

And the notion of oversight is something that is a very important constitutional responsibility that we have. This measure that the distinguished majority whip has pursued is, I believe, very important in recognizing that greater transparency and disclosure is important.

I do appreciate his commitment to ensure that as information comes forward, and his experience for 4 years as a college president demonstrates, that we will not, in fact, have to have a greater degree of transparency on what will be disclosed as to what is existing

on the walls of those college dormitories. But I do believe that the American people should have an opportunity to gain access to as much information as possible when it deals with the awarding of these grants.

I thank Chairman DAVIS and Mr. DAVIS and Mr. WAXMAN and all who have been involved in this and believe that it very importantly gets right at our core constitutional responsibility. I think this is a very, very helpful measure, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for his comments, his support of the bill and his clear understanding that as we bring transparency to the process of spending, that to not have transparency where most of the money is really spent would be a huge, huge gap in our efforts to make it easier to see how government money is spent, to see that it is more accountable and that we have a real way to access that, and the public as well as the Congress has a way to access that.

I thank the chairman and Mr. WAXMAN for the great work they have done to advance this bill.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. And as we shed more light and sunshine on congressional earmarks, grants are essentially executive earmarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Chairman DAVIS and our majority whip, Congressman BLUNT, for their leadership on this important legislation. I particularly want to thank the whip for making sure that this gets to the floor.

Our chairman knows and is regularly hearing our frustrations at the subcommittee level in Government Reform and Oversight because it has been so hard to get information from this administration. It was not easy from the last administration, either; and this is basic information that is necessary to do oversight.

So I rise in support of this bill and I thank the chairman for being persistent in backing up the subcommittee chairman in trying to receive this grant information in a searchable and user-friendly form.

Let me illustrate why H.R. 5060 is necessary.

We battled this with multiple agencies, whether it is the faith-based category as they give grants, National Parks, we have battled it in all kinds of narcotics oversight, but let me illustrate the specifics and detail in one of the most frustrating processes that I have ever dealt with that our majority whip just referred to in his statement.

In my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources on October 6, 2005, I sent a letter to

USAID seeking information about its funding of the pro-prostitution non-governmental organization called SANGRAM in violation of Public Law 108-25, the United States Leadership Against HIV-DS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003.

According to an unclassified State Department memorandum obtained by subcommittee staff, Restore International, an anti-trafficking NGO that works with law enforcement agencies in India, was confronted by an USAID-funded NGO, SANGRAM, while the former attempted to rescue and provide long-term care for child victims of sex trafficking. The confrontation led to the release of 17 minor girls, victims of trafficking, into the hands of traffickers and trafficking accomplices. Now get this, a tax-funded organization in violation of Federal law forced the release of girls who were being rescued from sex trafficking. They were victims of trafficking and they turned them back to the traffickers and trafficking accomplices.

According to this memorandum, SANGRAM "allowed a brothel keeper into a shelter to pressure the girls not to cooperate with counselors. The girls are now back in the brothels, being subjected to rape for profit."

On November 16, 2005, a USAID briefer asserted to the Government Reform Committee staff that USAID had "nothing to do with" the grant to the pro-prostitution SANGRAM, and that the committee's inquiries were "destructive." The subcommittee is now in possession of documents that demonstrate that USAID must provide a revised briefing to Congress on its true role.

These documents prove that USAID money financed the pro-prostitution SANGRAM through a second organization named Avert, which was established with the assistance of four USAID employees as a pass-through entity. USAID has held the ex-officio vice chairmanship of Avert since inception.

According to these documents, the USAID board member of Avert voted twice to award funding to SANGRAM, once on July 27, 2002, and again on December 3, 2004, the last time being some 18 months after the provisions of Public Law 108-25 prohibited taxpayer funding of pro-prostitution like SANGRAM.

That SANGRAM was a high-risk candidate for not complying with Public Law 108-25 should have been no surprise to USAID. SANGRAM was a co-signer, along with many other high-risk candidates, of a May 18, 2005, letter to President Bush opposing the anti-prostitution pledge.

Subcommittee staff found posted on a USAID-sponsored Web site a 5-year-old report from SANGRAM that states: "We believe that when involuntary initiation into prostitution occurs, a process of socialization within the institution of prostitution exists, whereby the involuntary nature of the business changes increasingly into one of

active acceptance, not necessarily with resignation. This is not a coercive process.”

I agree with President Bush that “it takes a special kind of depravity to exploit and hurt the most vulnerable members of society. Human traffickers rob children of their innocence; they expose them to the worst of life before they have seen much of life. Traffickers tear families apart. They treat their victims as nothing more than goods and commodities for sale to the highest bidder.”

It is inconceivable that an organization like SANGRAM could have received funding from the American taxpayer had USAID put in place an adequate management system to carry out Public Law 108-25.

On December 13, 2005, a large briefing team from the State Department and USAID met with staff from my subcommittee in order to demonstrate ownership of the problem and lay out corrective measures being taken. To my dismay and astonishment, the briefers were not prepared to discuss and exhibited little knowledge of the pass-through entity known as Avert that USAID has established and which served as the mechanism whereby NGOs in India were monitored and financed with American tax dollars.

Subcommittee staff knew more than the State Department USAID briefing team about this matter, thanks to Google searches on the Web for critical documents that had not been provided to the subcommittee by the administration.

At that meeting, USAID was requested by the subcommittee staff to establish an electronic registry for grantees and subgrantees to facilitate oversight by USAID Washington as well as by Congress and ensure compliance with the Federal law. That request has not been honored.

In the months since that December 13 appeal was made for an electronic registry, the subcommittee request has inspired two pieces of legislation: First in the other body, and the second we are debating here today. This scandal of financing pro-prostitution groups by USAID was highlighted by the authors in both Chambers as illustrating the need for this legislation.

On April 7, I asked USAID in writing to provide legal advice to make certain that all USAID grantees and subgrantees would be captured by H.R. 5060. That request, too, has not been honored.

I, for one, am out of patience having to wait months for agencies to reluctantly produce documents to shed light on how questionable projects are funded.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 5060 and begin the process of bringing sunshine on the processes of unelected bureaucrats doling out grants to questionable organizations.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I again thank Mr. WAXMAN and his staff and Mr.

DAVIS for being here, and all of the staff on the Government Reform Committee on the minority side, Anna Luitin, Christopher Davis, Robin Appleberry, and Brian Cohen for their contributions to this legislation as well. We thank you for working with us.

I would just add that I would urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 5060, as amended.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5060 requires the Office of Management and Budget to create a web-based database of Federal grants.

I want to thank Majority Whip BLUNT and Chairman DAVIS for working with us to make changes to the bill as originally drafted. Based on these revisions, I am supporting the bill.

As modified, H.R. 5060 will create a robust, fully searchable database of all Federal grants that is free for members of the public to use. The database will contain a significant amount of information about each grant awarded—including details about the grantee, the process under which the grant was awarded, as well as the purpose and requirements of the grant.

Currently, there is an existing grants data system that is available to Members of Congress. The database that will be created under H.R. 5060 is an improvement over this existing system in two key ways: it will include more information and it will be available to the public, not just Members of Congress. As a result, this database will serve as a useful tool for individuals and organizations hoping to understand how the Federal Government distributes funds.

There is also an urgent need to improve the existing database of Federal contracts. Earlier this week, I released a report finding that the “shadow government” of private companies working under Federal contract has exploded in size over the past 5 years. Far more taxpayer dollars now go to contracts than to grants.

I had hoped that we would be able to add language improving the current contracts database, the Federal Procurement Data System, to this bill. The FPDS can be hard to use and is not fully accurate. Although it contains a significant amount of information about Federal contracts, it is not easily or freely searchable by members of the public. It must be fixed in order to provide the public with the ability to truly understand the role of contracts in the Federal Government.

We were not able to reach agreement on language to add a contracts database to this legislation. But Chairman DAVIS has pledged to work with me to address this issue in separate legislation.

Again, I want to thank the Majority Whip and the Chairman for working with us to amend H.R. 5060, and look forward to continuing this collaboration as we address the problems with the existing database of Federal contracts.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5060, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND HIGHER EDUCATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2006

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5603) to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5603

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2006”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.

Section 2(a) of the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-81; 20 U.S.C. 1001 note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2006” and inserting “September 30, 2006”.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or in the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 as amended by this Act, shall be construed to limit or otherwise alter the authorizations of appropriations for, or the durations of, programs contained in the amendments made by the Higher Education Reconciliation Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-171) to the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Taxpayer-Teacher Protection Act of 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5603.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5603, the Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2006. This bill will provide a clean extension of the Higher Education Act for 3 months. This bill enjoys bipartisan support and is cosponsored by the chairman and ranking members of the full Education Committee and the Higher Education Subcommittee.

On March 30, 2006, the House of Representatives completed its work and passed the College Access and Opportunity Act to fully reauthorize the Higher Education Act. We strengthened Pell Grants, improved the Perkins Loan program, and expanded access for millions of American students.

However, the Senate has not yet acted to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. The Senate should soon act to pass the reauthorization bill so we

can have these important higher education reforms signed into law during this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clean extension that will allow the important programs of the Higher Education Act to continue past their current June 30, 2006, expiration date until September 30, 2006. Programs like Pell Grants and Perkins Loans are the passports out of poverty for millions of American students. We must not break our commitment to higher education.

□ 1100

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 5603.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 5603, a 3-month extension of the Higher Education Act. I have enjoyed working with the new chairman of the subcommittee Mr. KELLER on this bill.

This bill, in essence, temporarily extends the last portions of the Higher Education Act not reauthorized in the reconciliation package.

During the 1998 reauthorization, I had the opportunity to work closely with Chairman MCKEON, now chairman of the full committee, in crafting a bipartisan bill. Our reauthorization attempts this Congress have been a little more rocky than in 1998. Most of the hard-hitting changes to the Higher Education Act and student aid have already been passed in reconciliation, which I opposed. That action forever removed nearly \$12 billion from student aid programs and missed an opportunity to reinvest in students who are already struggling to pay for college.

In response, along with Representative MILLER, I recently introduced a bill called the Reverse the Raid on Student Aid Act, H.R. 5150. This bill would have cut interest rates in half for students and parents taking out subsidized loans, the borrowers most in need. This bill would save the average borrower already saddled with \$17,500 in debt \$6,600 over the life of their loan.

The consideration and passage of the Reverse the Raid on Student Aid Act is a critical investment in our global competitiveness and would offer real relief to students and families in need.

Let's set the record straight on Pell. Today we will hear about Republican support of Pell Grants. Yes, overall, spending on Pell Grants is on the rise, but Pell Grants are semientitlement programs, which means that if eligible students apply for Federal financial aid, they automatically get a Pell Grant. The increased spending they referred to is not because we are doing more to help individual students struggling to pay for college; this is because more students qualify, and more students are going to college. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have more poor students that need our help.

In reality, the individual Pell Grant has seen no meaningful increase in the

last 5 years. In fact, Pell Grants today are worth \$900 less in inflation-adjusted terms than they were in the 1975-1976 school year.

Until the appropriators restore the actual buying power of the Pell Grant to the \$5,100 level promised by our President 6 years ago, we have not done anything meaningful in helping the students and families struggling to pay for college.

As we worked towards reauthorizing the remainder of the higher education through H.R. 609 in March, I had hoped we could change the tone of debate and act in the interest of the students that the Higher Education Act was intended to help. Unfortunately, in the end, my concerns in the bill still far outweighed any benefit. The bill that was considered was not something I considered comfortable to support, and, for that reason, opposed it.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman KELLER and Chairman MCKEON for offering H.R. 5603, the 3-month extension of the Higher Education Act. And because we still have time to work on this, and hopefully things can change, we can achieve some repair work, repair of the reconciliation act. I will support this and have cosponsored the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the full Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. MCKEON.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the subcommittee chairman for his works on bringing this bill to the floor, and thank Mr. KILDEE for his work in supporting the bill.

It is important that we extend this act and give the Senate time to act on the bill, so I would encourage all of our colleagues to support the bill to help our young people get the education they need to realize the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5603, the Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2006. I thank the Chairman of the 21st Century Competitiveness Subcommittee, Mr. KELLER, for his work on this bill, as well as his consistent efforts on behalf of our Nation's college students and their families.

Discretionary programs under the Higher Education Act will expire on June 30, 2006, and this legislation before us simply extends the programs for an additional three months.

Earlier this year, when the Deficit Reduction Act was signed into law, we authorized the Act's mandatory spending programs. In the process, we reduced lender subsidies; increased loan limits for students; simplified the financial aid process; and provided additional resources for needy students studying math, science, and critical foreign languages in college. And we managed to achieve all that while also making certain that student aid programs operate more efficiently, saving U.S. taxpayers billions of dollars.

In March, the House backed H.R. 609, the College Access & Opportunity Act, which would reauthorize the remaining programs

under the Higher Education Act. This bill would strengthen the Pell Grant program, empower parents and students through "sunshine" and transparency in college costs and accreditation, improve college access programs, and much more. I am hopeful that our friends on the other side of the Capitol will act on these reforms soon so these extensions will become a thing of the past.

In the meantime, however, Congress again must act to extend the Higher Education Act, which we have done previously on several occasions and with bipartisan support. The Second Higher Education Extension Act will ensure that vital Federal college access and student aid programs continue to serve those students who depend upon them. At the same time, the bill also gives our Senate colleagues additional time to complete a renewal of the Higher Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing new realities in an increasingly competitive global economy. U.S. workers of today are no longer just competing with one another for jobs, but also against counterparts across the globe. One avenue we have for tackling today's new climate is through education in general, but more significantly through higher education. That's why the Federal investment in the Higher Education Act is so vital. Our Nation has millions of low and middle income students aspiring to go to college. They not only deserve an opportunity to educate themselves, but we personally depend on their having that opportunity.

I encourage my colleagues to support the bill before us today and continue to work toward a fundamental reform package so that we can better serve American students pursuing the dream of a college education.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, almost 3 months to the day, I stood here in support of the third extension to the Higher Education Act with the hope that it would be the last short-term measure we needed to pass before we finally produced an improved bipartisan and long overdue reauthorization bill that reflects the best interest of America's college students.

I now rise in support of H.R. 5603 with a different hope, that the pending version of the Higher Education Act that the House passed in late March does not advance in the Senate, and that during the next session of Congress, under a new majority, we start over by making this legislation truly about increasing access and affordability.

On July 1, student borrowers will be burdened with a higher interest rate on their loans as a result of the administration's fiscal irresponsibility. Student loan interest rates are based on the 91-day T-bill, which is directly tied to the status of our economy. Based on today's current T-bill, interest rates for student borrowers who do not consolidate by July 1 will jump from 5.3 percent to 7.14 percent, which is a 34 percent increase in the rate.

Record-breaking budget deficits, tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, and an economic policy flawed by fiscal

irresponsibility have resulted in higher interest rates and our Nation's students having to pay for the mistakes of this administration and this Congress.

Last year the House leadership chose to cut student loans to the tune of \$12 billion through the Deficit Reduction Act. With those cuts in the budget reconciliation bill, and now with higher interest rates on student loans, we are sending a message to America's students and their families that they are no longer among this Nation's top priorities.

As high school graduates and their proud parents calculate how they can squeeze college costs into their budget, they are discovering that it is an uphill climb for most families, made tougher by new higher interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I support this extension that we are considering here today, but I do not support the direction and actions of this Congress as it relates to higher education. We must do more to ensure that every qualified student has the chance to go to college.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the last couple of weeks and months have been times of mixed emotions for a lot of American families. Many people got the thick envelope in the mail that told them they were accepted to the school they really want to get into. And then it became time to figure out how to pay for it.

Now, a few families were fortunate enough, very few families were fortunate enough, they have enough income to meet the tuition payment. Others immediately went down to the bank and made a home equity loan application to figure out a way to borrow enough money to send their son or daughter to school. Others weren't so fortunate and had to decide some other course, maybe including not going to school at all. And then others who are themselves already parents who are raising children and working full time just can't figure out a way to do it without putting themselves so far in debt that it makes no sense to get an education.

This bill is a missed opportunity to address that problem. There were significant savings generated in the student loan programs that were thrown away by the reconciliation bill, the budget-cutting bill passed by this Congress late in 2005. Money that could have been used to raise loan limits, eliminate origination fees, expand programs where people can pay back their loan as a function of their income, money that could have been used to increase Pell Grants was instead put into the economic priorities of this majority: tax cuts for the very wealthy, subsidies for corporate America and misadventures around the world. So here we are feebly extending existing terms

of this bill, while millions of American families struggle with the very real problem of how to pay for a higher education.

This is a missed opportunity. It calls for a radical change in the country's priorities away from tax breaks for the wealthy, away from welfare for corporate America, away from misadventures around the world, toward educating and investing in the people of this country. Those changes in priorities are coming.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I also yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5603.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4755

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor from the bill, H.R. 4755.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SENIOR INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 2006

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5293) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2007 through 2011, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5293

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Senior Independence Act of 2006”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Establishment of Administration on Aging.

Sec. 4. Functions of the Assistant Secretary.

Sec. 5. Federal agency consultation.

Sec. 6. Administration.

Sec. 7. Evaluation.

Sec. 8. Reports.

Sec. 9. Contractual, commercial and private pay relationships; appropriate use of Act funds.

Sec. 10. Nutrition education.

Sec. 11. Pension counseling and information programs.

Sec. 12. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 13. Purpose; administration.

Sec. 14. Authorization of appropriations; uses of funds.

Sec. 15. Organization.

Sec. 16. Area plans.

Sec. 17. State plans.

Sec. 18. Payments.

Sec. 19. Nutrition services incentive program.

Sec. 20. Consumer contributions.

Sec. 21. Supportive services and senior centers program.

Sec. 22. Nutrition service.

Sec. 23. Congregate nutrition program.

Sec. 24. Home delivered nutrition services.

Sec. 25. Criteria.

Sec. 26. Nutrition.

Sec. 27. Evaluation of nutrition projects.

Sec. 28. Improving indoor air quality to buildings where seniors congregate.

Sec. 29. Caregiver support program definitions.

Sec. 30. Caregiver support program.

Sec. 31. Activities of national significance.

Sec. 32. Title IV grant programs.

Sec. 33. Career preparation for the field of aging.

Sec. 34. Health care service demonstration projects in rural areas.

Sec. 35. Demonstration projects for multigenerational activities.

Sec. 36. Native American programs.

Sec. 37. Multidisciplinary centers.

Sec. 38. Responsibilities of Assistant Secretary.

Sec. 39. Community service employment-based training for older Americans.

Sec. 40. Native Americans caregiver support program.

Sec. 41. Vulnerable elder rights protection activities.

Sec. 42. Native American organization provisions.

Sec. 43. Elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation prevention.

Sec. 44. Technical amendments.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (10) to read as follows:

“(10) The terms ‘assistive device’, ‘assistive technology’, and ‘assistive technology service’ have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3002).”

(2) by amending paragraph (12)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) evidence-based health promotion programs, including programs related to the prevention and mitigation of the effects of chronic disease (including osteoporosis, hypertension, obesity, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease), alcohol and substance abuse reduction, smoking cessation, weight loss and control, stress management, falls prevention, physical activity, and improved nutrition through the consumption of a healthful diet and multivitamin-mineral supplementation.”

(3) in paragraph (29)(E)—

(A) in clause (i) by striking “and” at the end, (B) in clause (ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and” , and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) older individuals at risk for institutional placement.”

(4) by amending paragraph (24) to read as follows:

“(24) The term ‘exploitation’ means the fraudulent or otherwise illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of an individual that uses the resources of an older individual for monetary or personal benefit, profit, or gain, or that results in depriving an older individual of rightful access to, or use of, benefits, resources, belongings, or assets.”

(5) by amending paragraph (34) to read as follows:

“(34) The term ‘neglect’ means—

“(A) the failure of a caregiver or fiduciary to provide goods or services that are necessary to maintain the health or safety of an elder; or
“(B) self neglect.”

(6) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (43) as paragraphs (43), (7), (48), (37), (25), (26), (52), (13), (46), (8), (28), (12), (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), (10), (24), (35), (11), (14), (15), (17), (19), (20), (21), (22), (27), (29), (30), (32) (33), (36), (38), (39), (40), (41), (42), (49), (51), (18), and (47), respectively,

(7) by transferring such paragraphs so as to arrange them in numerical order as so redesignated,

(8) by inserting after paragraph (3), as so redesignated the following:

“(4) The term ‘Aging and Disability Resource Center’ means a program established by a State as part of the State’s system of long-term care, to provide a coordinated system for providing—

“(A) comprehensive information on available public and private long-term care programs, options, and resources;

“(B) personal counseling to assist individuals in assessing their existing or anticipated long-term care needs, and developing and implementing a plan for long-term care designed to meet their specific needs and circumstances; and

“(C) consumer access to the range of publicly-supported long-term care programs for which they may be eligible, by serving as a convenient point of entry for such programs.”,

(9) by inserting after paragraph (8), as so redesignated, the following:

“(9) The term ‘at risk for institutional placement’ means, with respect to an older individual, that such individual is unable to perform at least two activities of daily living without substantial human assistance (including verbal reminding, physical cuing, or supervision) and is determined by the State to be in need of placement in a long-term care facility.”,

(10) by inserting after paragraph (15), as so redesignated, the following:

“(16) The term ‘elder justice’ means efforts to prevent, detect, treat, intervene in, and respond to elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation and to protect elders with diminished capacity while maximizing their autonomy.”,

(11) by inserting after paragraph (22), as so redesignated, the following:

“(23) The term ‘Hispanic serving institution’ has the meaning as defined in section 502 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101A).”,

(12) by inserting after paragraph (30), as so redesignated, the following:

“(31) The term ‘long-term care’ means any services, care, or items (including assistive devices), including disease prevention and health promotion services, in-home services, and case management service—

“(A) intended to assist individuals in coping with, and to the extent practicable compensate for, functional impairments in carrying out activities of daily living;

“(B) furnished at home, in a community care setting (including a small community care setting as defined in subsection (g)(1), and a large community care setting as defined in subsection (h)(1), of section 1929 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396t)), or in a long-term care facility; and

“(C) not furnished to prevent, diagnose, treat, or cure a medical disease or condition.”,

(13) by inserting after paragraph (33), as so redesignated, the following:

“(34) The term ‘multivitamin-mineral supplement’ means a dietary supplement that provides at least two-third’s of the essential vitamins and minerals at 100 percent of the daily value levels as determined by the Food and Drug Administration.”,

(14) by inserting after paragraph (43), as so redesignated, the following:

“(44) The term ‘self-directed care’ means an approach to providing services (including programs, benefits, supports, and technology) under this Act intended to an older individual to assist such individual with activities of daily living, in which

“(A) such services (including the amount, duration, scope, provider, and location of such

services) are planned, budgeted, and purchased under the direction and control of such individual;

“(B) such individual is provided with such information and assistance as necessary and appropriate to enable such individual to make informed decisions about his or her care options;

“(C) the needs, capabilities, and preferences of such individual with respect to such services, and such individual’s ability to direct and control his or her receipt of such services, are assessed by the area agency on aging (or other agency designated by the area agency on aging);

“(D) based on the assessment made under subparagraph (C), the area agency on aging (or other agency designated by the area agency on aging) develops together with such individual and his or her family, caregiver, or legal representative—

“(i) a plan of services for such individual that specifies which services such individual will be responsible for directing;

“(ii) a determination of the role of family members (and others whose participation is sought by such individual) in providing services under such plan; and

“(iii) a budget for such services; and

“(E) the area agency on aging or State agency provides for oversight of such individual’s self-directed receipt of services, including steps to ensure the quality of services provided and the appropriate use of funds under this Act.

“(45) The term ‘self-neglect’ means an adult’s inability, due to physical or mental impairment or diminished capacity, to perform essential self-care tasks including—

“(A) obtaining essential food, clothing, shelter, and medical care;

“(B) obtaining goods and services necessary to maintain physical health, mental health, or general safety; or

“(C) managing one’s own financial affairs.”,

(15) by inserting after paragraph (49), as so redesignated, the following:

“(50) The term ‘State system of long-term care’ means the Federal, State, and local programs and activities administered by a State that provide, support, or facilitate access to long-term care to individuals in such State.”.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADMINISTRATION ON AGING.

Section 201 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3011) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e)(1) The Assistant Secretary may designate within the Administration responsibility for elder abuse prevention and services.

“(2) It shall be the duty of the assistant secretary, acting through the person designated with responsibility for elder abuse prevention and services, to develop objectives, priorities, policy, and a long-term plan for—

“(A) carrying out elder justice programs and activities relating to—

“(i) elder abuse prevention, detection, treatment, and intervention, and response;

“(ii) training of individuals regarding the matters described in clause (i); and

“(iii) the improvement of the elder justice system in the United States;

“(B) collecting and disseminating data relating to the abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older individuals;

“(C) disseminating information concerning best practices regarding, and providing training on, carrying out activities related to abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older individuals;

“(D) conducting research related to abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older individuals;

“(E) providing technical assistance to States and other eligible entities under title VII;

“(F) assisting States and other eligible entities under title VII to develop strategic plans to better coordinate elder justice activities, research, and training; and

“(G) promoting collaborative efforts and diminishing duplicative efforts in the development

and carrying out of elder justice programs at the Federal, State, and local levels.

“(f)(1) The Assistant Secretary may designate an officer or employee who shall be responsible for the administration of mental health services authorized under this Act;

“(2) It shall be the duty of the Assistant Secretary, acting through the individual designated in paragraph (1), to develop objectives, priorities, and a long-term plan for supporting State and local efforts involving education, prevention, detection, and treatment of mental disorders, including age-related dementia, depression, and Alzheimer’s disease and related neurological disorders.”.

SEC. 4. FUNCTIONS OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

Section 202 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (5) by inserting “assistive technology,” after “housing,”,

(B) in paragraph (12)—

(i) by striking “(12)” and inserting the following:

“(12)(A) consult and coordinate activities with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and other federal entities to implement and build awareness of programs providing benefits affecting older individuals; and

“(B)”.

(C) in paragraph (20)—

(i) by striking “and area agencies on aging” and inserting “, area agencies on aging, and service providers”;

(ii) by striking “and benefits” and inserting “benefits”;

(iii) by inserting “benefits under any other applicable Federal program, or any other service (including technology and internet-based decision support tools) to assist consumers to learn about, to receive benefits under, and to participate in programs for which they may be eligible” after “(7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.)”;

(iv) by inserting “(A)” after “(20)”, and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) provide technical assistance and support for benefits enrollment assistance and outreach to support efforts to inform and enroll low-income older individuals who may be eligible to participate, but who are not participating, in Federal and State programs for which they are eligible, and may in cooperation with Federal partners, make grants or contracts to establish a National Center on Senior Benefits Outreach and Enrollment, which shall—

“(i) maintain and update web-based decision supports and enrollment tools and integrated, person-centered systems designed to inform older individuals about the full range of benefits for which they may be eligible;

“(ii) utilize cost-effective strategies to find and enroll those with greatest economic need;

“(iii) create and support efforts for Aging and Disability Resource Centers, and other public and private State and community-based organizations and coalitions, including faith-based organizations, to serve as enrollment benefit centers;

“(iv) develop and maintain an information clearinghouse on best practices and cost-effective methods for identifying and enrolling limited income older Americans in benefits for which they are eligible; and

“(v) provide, in collaboration with Federal partners administering programs, training and technical assistance on effective outreach, screening, enrollment and follow-up strategies.”.

(D) in paragraph (26)—

(i) in subsection (D)—

(I) by striking “gaps in”, and

(II) by inserting “(including services that would permit such individuals to receive long-term care in home and community-based settings)” after “individuals”, and

(ii) in subsection (E) by striking “and” at the end,

(E) in paragraph (27)—

(i) in subparagraph (B) by adding “and” at the end,

(ii) in subparagraph (C) by striking the semicolon and inserting a period, and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (D), and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(28) make available to States, area agencies on aging, and service providers information and technical assistance to support the provision of evidence-based disease prevention and health promotion services.”, and

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c), and inserting the following:

“(b) To promote the development and implementation of comprehensive, coordinated systems at Federal, State, and local levels for providing long-term care in home and community-based settings, in a manner responsive to the needs and preferences of older individuals and their family caregivers, the Assistant Secretary shall, consistent with the applicable provisions of this title—

“(1) collaborate, coordinate, and consult with other Federal agencies and departments responsible for formulating and implementing programs, benefits, and services related to providing long-term care, and may make grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements with funds received from other Federal entities;

“(2) conduct research and demonstration projects to identify innovative, cost-effective strategies for modifying State systems of long-term care to—

“(A) respond to the needs and preferences of older individuals and family caregivers; and

“(B) target services to individuals at risk for institutional placement, to permit such individuals to remain in home and community-based care settings;

“(3) establish criteria and promote the implementation (through area agencies on aging, service providers, and such other entities as the Assistant Secretary determines to be appropriate) of evidence-based programs to assist older individuals and their family caregivers in learning about and making behavioral changes intended to reduce the risk of injury, disease, and disability among older individuals;

“(4) facilitate, in coordination with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Cash and Counseling National Program Office, and other Federal entities as appropriate, the provision of long-term care in home and community-based settings, including the provision of self-directed care models that—

“(A) provide for the assessment of the needs and preferences of an individual at risk for institutional placement to help such individual avoid unnecessary nursing home placement and depletion of income and assets to qualify for Medicaid eligibility;

“(B) respond to the needs and preferences of such individual and provide the option for the individual (or representative, as appropriate) to direct and control the receipt of support services provided;

“(C) assist an older individual (or a representative, as appropriate) develop a plan for long-term support, including the selecting, budgeting, and purchasing of home and community-based long-term care and supportive services;

(for purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘representative’ means a person appointed by the eligible individual, or legally acting on the individual’s behalf, to represent or advise the individual in financial or service coordination matters);

“(5) provide for the Administration to play a lead role with respect to issues concerning home and community-based long-term care, including—

“(A) directing (as the Secretary or the President determines to be appropriate) or otherwise participating in departmental and interdepartmental activities concerning long-term care;

“(B) reviewing and commenting on departmental rules, regulations, and policies related to providing long-term care; and

“(C) making recommendations to the Secretary with respect to home and community-based long-term care, including recommendations based on findings made through projects conducted under paragraph (2);

“(6) promote, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies, enhanced awareness by the public of the importance of planning in advance for long-term care and the availability of information and resources to assist in such planning;

“(7) implement in all States Aging and Disability Resource Centers—

“(A) to serve as visible and trusted sources of information on the full range of long-term care options that are available in the community, including both institutional and home and community-based care;

“(B) to provide personalized and consumer friendly assistance to empower people to make informed decisions about their care options;

“(C) to provide coordinated and streamlined access to all publicly supported long-term care options so that consumers can obtain the care they need through a single intake, assessment and eligibility determination process;

“(D) to help people to plan ahead for their future long-term care needs; and

“(E) to assist, in coordination with the State Health Insurance Assistance Program, Medicare beneficiaries in understanding and accessing the Prescription Drug Coverage and preventative health benefits available under the Medicare Modernization Act;

“(8) establish, either directly or through grants or contracts, national technical assistance programs to assist State agencies, area agencies on aging, and community-based service providers funded under this Act in implementing—

“(A) such home and community-based long-term care systems, including evidence-based programs; and

“(B) such evidence-based health promotion and disease prevention programs;

“(9) develop, in collaboration with the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, performance standards and measures for use by States to determine the extent to which their systems of long-term care fulfill the objectives described in this subsection; and

“(10) conduct such other activities as the Assistant Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(c) The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Corporation for National and Community Service, shall—

“(1) encourage and permit voluntary groups active in supportive services and civic engagement, including youth organizations active at the secondary or postsecondary levels, to participate and be involved individually or through representative groups, in such programs or activities to the maximum extent feasible;

“(2) develop a comprehensive strategy for utilizing older individuals to address critical local needs of national concern, including the engagement of older individuals in the activities of public and nonprofit organizations such as community-based and faith-based organizations; and

“(3) encourage other community capacity building initiatives involving older individuals, with particular attention to initiatives that demonstrate the effectiveness and cost savings in meeting critical needs.”.

SEC. 5. FEDERAL AGENCY CONSULTATION.

Section 203 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3013) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)(A) by striking “(with particular attention to low-income minority older individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)” and inserting “(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)”, and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (17) by striking “and” at the end,

(B) in paragraph (18) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”, and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(19) sections 4 and 5 of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3003-3004).”.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION.

Section 205 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3016) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C) by adding “and” at the end,

(ii) in subparagraph (D) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period, and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (E), and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

“(i) designing, implementing, and evaluating evidence-based programs to support improved nutrition and regular physical activity for older individuals;”,

(II) by amending clause (iii) to read as follows:

“(iii) conducting outreach and disseminating evidence-based information to nutrition service providers about the benefits of healthful diets and regular physical activity, including information about the most current Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341), the Food Guide Pyramid published jointly by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, and advances in nutrition science;”,

(III) in clause (vii) by striking “and” at the end, and

(IV) by striking clause (viii) and inserting the following:

“(viii) disseminating guidance that describes strategies for improving the nutritional quality of meals provided under title III, particularly strategies for increasing the consumption of whole grains, lowfat dairy products, fruits and vegetables;

“(ix) developing and disseminating guidelines for conducting nutrient analyses of meals provided in subparts 1 and 2 of part C, including guidelines for averaging key nutrients over an appropriate period of time; and

“(x) providing technical assistance to the regional offices of the Administration with respect to each duty described in clauses (i) through (viii).”, and

(ii) by amending subparagraph (C)(i) to read as follows:

“(i) have expertise in nutrition, energy balance, and meal planning; and”.

SEC. 7. EVALUATION.

The 1st sentence of section 206(g) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3017(g)) is amended to read as follows:

“From the total amount appropriated for each fiscal year to carry out title III, the Secretary may use such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed 1/2 of 1 percent of such amount, for purposes of conducting evaluations under this section, either directly or through grants or contracts.”.

SEC. 8. REPORTS.

Section 207(b)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3018(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B) by striking “Labor” and inserting “the Workforce”, and

(2) in subparagraph (C) by striking “Labor and Human Resources” and inserting “Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions”.

SEC. 9. CONTRACTUAL, COMMERCIAL AND PRIVATE PAY RELATIONSHIPS; APPROPRIATE USE OF ACT FUNDS.

(a) PRIVATE PAY RELATIONSHIPS; APPROPRIATE USE OF ACT FUNDS.—Section 212 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3020c) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 212. CONTRACTING AND GRANT AUTHORITY; PRIVATE PAY RELATIONSHIPS; APPROPRIATE USE OF FUNDS.

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to subsection (b), this Act shall not be construed to prevent a recipient of a grant or a contract from entering into an agreement—

“(1) with a profitmaking organization;

“(2) under which funds provided under such grant or contract are used to pay part or all of a cost (including an administrative cost) incurred by such recipient to carry out a contract or commercial relationship for the benefit of older individuals or their family caregivers, whether such relationship is carried out to implement a provision of this Act or to conduct activities inherently associated with implementing such provision; or

“(3) under which any individual, regardless of age or income (including the family caregiver of such individual), who seeks to receive 1 or more services pays, at their own private expense, to receive such services based on the fair market value of such services.

“(b) *ENSURING APPROPRIATE USE OF FUNDS.*—An agreement described under subsection (a) may not—

“(1) be made without the prior approval of the State agency (or, in the case of a grantee under title VI, without the prior recommendation of the Director of the Office for American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Aging and the prior approval of the Assistant Secretary);

“(2) directly or indirectly provide for, or have the effect of, paying, reimbursing, or otherwise compensating an entity under such agreement in an amount that exceeds the fair market value of the goods or services furnished by such entity under such agreement;

“(3) result in the displacement of services otherwise available to an older individual with the greatest social need, an older individual with greatest economic need, or an older individual who is at risk for institutional placement; or

“(4) in any other way compromise, undermine, or be inconsistent with the objective of serving the needs of older individuals, as determined by the Assistant Secretary.”

SEC. 10. NUTRITION EDUCATION.

Section 214 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3020e) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 214. NUTRITION EDUCATION.

“The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall conduct outreach and provide technical assistance to agencies and organizations that serve older individuals to assist such agencies and organizations to carry out integrated health promotion and disease prevention programs that are designed for older individuals and that include nutrition education, physical activity, and other activities to modify behavior and to improve health literacy (including information on optimal nutrient intake) through education and counseling in accordance with section 339(2)(J).”

SEC. 11. PENSION COUNSELING AND INFORMATION PROGRAMS.

Section 215 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3020e-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(1)(J) by striking “and low-income retirees” and inserting “, low income retirees, and older individuals with limited English proficiency”;

(2) in subsection (f) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) The ability of the entity to perform effective outreach to affected populations, particularly populations with limited English proficiency and other populations that are identified in need of special outreach.”; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2) by inserting “(including individuals with limited English proficiency)” after “individuals”.

SEC. 12. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 216 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3020f) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking “2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005” and inserting “2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.”; and

(2) in subsections (b) and (c) by striking “year” and all that follows through “years”, and inserting “years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011”.

SEC. 13. PURPOSE; ADMINISTRATION.

Section 301(a)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3021(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D) by striking “and” at the end,

(2) in subparagraph (E) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) organizations with experience in providing senior volunteer services, such as Federal volunteer programs administered by the Corporation for National and Community Service designed to provide training, placement, and stipends for volunteers in community service settings.”

SEC. 14. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; USES OF FUNDS.

Section 303 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a)(1), (b), and (d) by striking “year 2001” and all that follows through “years” each place it appears, and inserting “years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1),

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “(2)” and inserting “(1)”, and

(ii) by striking “each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years” and inserting “for fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “(3)” and inserting “(2)”, and

(ii) by striking “paragraphs (1) and (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”.

SEC. 15. ORGANIZATION.

Section 305(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3025(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(E) by striking “(with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)” each place it appears and inserting “(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(E) by striking “with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas” and inserting “with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) the State agency shall, consistent with this section, promote the development and implementation of a comprehensive, coordinated system in such State for providing long-term care in home and community-based settings, in a manner responsive to the needs and preferences of older individuals and their family caregivers, by—

“(A) collaborating, coordinating, and consulting with other agencies in such State responsible for formulating, implementing, and administering programs, benefits, and services related to providing long-term care;

“(B) participating in any State government activities concerning long-term care, including reviewing and commenting on any State rules, regulations, and policies related thereto;

“(C) conducting analyses and making recommendations, and implementing programs and strategies to modify the State’s system of long-term care to better—

“(i) respond to the needs and preferences of older individuals and family caregivers;

“(ii) facilitate the provision of long-term care in home and community-based settings through service providers; and

“(iii) target services to individuals at risk for institutional placement, to permit such individuals to remain in home and community-based care settings;

“(D) implement (through area agencies on aging, service providers, and such other entities as the State determines to be appropriate) evidence-based programs to assist older individuals and their family caregivers in learning about and making behavioral changes intended to reduce the risk of injury, disease, and disability among older individuals; and

“(E) providing for the availability and distribution (through public education campaigns, aging and disability resource centers, area agencies on aging, and other appropriate means) of information relating to—

“(i) the need to plan in advance for long-term care; and

“(ii) the range of available public and private long-term care programs, options, and resources.”

SEC. 16. AREA PLANS.

Section 306 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3026) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “(with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)” each place it appears and inserting “(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)”; and

(ii) by inserting “the number of older individuals at risk for institutional placement residing in such area,” after “individuals) residing in such area,”;

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by amending clause (i) to read as follows: “(i) provide assurances that the area agency on aging will—

“(I) set specific objectives, consistent with State policy, for providing services to older individuals with greatest economic need, older individuals with greatest social need, and older individuals at risk for institutional placement;

“(II) include in the area plan specific objectives for providing services to low-income minority older individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas; and

“(III) include in the area plan proposed methods to achieve such objectives;”, and

(II) in clause (ii) by inserting “(including older individuals with limited English proficiency)” after “low income minority individuals” each place it appears; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by moving the left margin of each of subparagraph (B), clauses (i) and (ii), and subparagraphs (I) through (VI) of clause (i), 2 ems to the left,

(II) in clause (i)—

(aa) in subclause (V) by striking “and” at the end; and

(bb) by adding at the end the following:

“(VI) older individuals at risk for institutional placement; and”; and

(III) by striking “(VI)” and inserting “(VII)”,

(C) in paragraph (5) by inserting “and individuals at risk for institutional placement” after “severe disabilities”;

(D) in paragraph (6)—

(i) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (i) by striking “and” at the end,

(II) in clause (ii) by adding “and” at the end,

and

(III) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) make use of trained volunteers in providing direct services delivered to elderly and disabled individuals needing such care and, if possible, work in coordination with volunteer programs (including programs administered by the Corporation for National Service) designed

to provide training, placement, and stipends for volunteers in community service settings.”

(ii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by inserting “family caregivers of such individuals,” after “Act,” and

(II) by inserting “service providers, the business community,” after “individuals,” and

(iii) by amending subparagraph (F) to read as follows:

“(F) in coordination with the State unit on aging and the State agency responsible for mental health services, increase public awareness of mental health disorders, remove barriers to diagnosis and treatment, and coordinate mental health services provided (including mental health screenings) with funds expended by the area agency on aging with mental health services provided by community health centers and by other public agencies and nonprofit private organizations;”

(E) by amending paragraph (7) to read as follows:

“(7) provide that the area agency on aging shall, consistent with this section, facilitate the area-wide development and implementation of a comprehensive, coordinated system for providing long-term care in home and community-based settings, in a manner responsive to the needs and preferences of older individuals and their family caregivers, by—

“(A) collaborating, coordinating, and consulting with other local public and private agencies and organizations responsible for administering programs, benefits, and services related to providing long-term care;

“(B) conducting analyses, making recommendations, and implementing programs with respect to strategies for modifying the local system of long-term care to better—

“(i) respond to the needs and preferences of older individuals and family caregivers;

“(ii) facilitate the provision, through service providers, of long-term care in home and community-based settings; and

“(iii) target services to older individuals at risk for institutional placement, to permit such individuals to remain in home and community-based care settings;

“(C) implement, through the agency or service providers, evidence-based programs to assist older individuals and their family caregivers in learning about and making behavioral changes intended to reduce the risk of injury, disease, and disability among older individuals; and

“(D) provide for the availability and distribution (through public education campaigns, aging and disability resource centers, and other appropriate means) of information relating to—

“(i) the need to plan in advance for long-term care; and

“(ii) the range of available public and private long-term care programs, options, and resources;”

(F) by striking paragraph (14) and the 2 paragraphs (15),

(G) by redesignating paragraph (16) as paragraph (14), and

(I) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) provide assurances that funds received under this title will be used—

“(A) in a manner, consistent with paragraph (4), that gives priority in furnishing benefits and services to older individuals with greatest economic need, older individuals with greatest social need, and older individuals at risk for institutional placement; and

“(B) in compliance with the assurances specified in paragraph (13) and the limitations specified in section 212(b); and

“(16) provide, to the maximum extent feasible, for the furnishing of services under this Act consistent with self-directed care.”

(2) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), and (3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b)(1) An area agency on aging may include in the area plan an assessment of how prepared

the planning and service area is for any anticipated change in the number of older individual during the 10-year period following the fiscal year for which the plan is submitted. Such assessment may include—

“(A) the projected change in the number of older individuals in the planning and service area;

“(B) an analysis of how such change may affect such individuals, including such individuals with low incomes, such individuals with greatest economic need, minority older individuals, older individuals residing in rural areas, and older individuals with limited English proficiency;

“(C) an analysis of how the programs, policies, and services provided in the planning and service area can be improved, and how resource levels can be adjusted, to meet the needs of the changing population of older individuals in such area; and

“(D) an analysis of how the change in the number of individuals 85 years of age and older is expected to affect the need for supportive services.

“(2) An area agency on aging, in cooperation with government officials, State agencies, tribal organizations, or local entities, may make recommendations to government officials in the planning and service area and the State, on actions determined by the area agency to build the capacity in the planning and service area to meet the needs of older individuals for—

“(A) health and human services;

“(B) land use;

“(C) housing;

“(D) transportation;

“(E) public safety;

“(F) workforce and economic development;

“(G) recreation;

“(H) education;

“(I) civic engagement; and

“(J) any other service as determined by such agency.”

SEC. 17. STATE PLANS.

Section 307(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3027(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by striking “with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas” and inserting “low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas”;

(2) by striking paragraph (15),

(3) by redesignating paragraph (14) as paragraph (15),

(4) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) The plan shall, with respect to the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which such plan is prepared—

“(A) identify the number of low-income minority older individuals in the State, including the number of low-income older individuals with limited English proficiency; and

“(B) describe the methods used to satisfy the service needs of such minority older individuals, including the plan to service the needs of older individuals with limited English proficiency.”

(5) in clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (16)(A) by striking “(with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)” each place it appears and inserting “(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)”;

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(27) The plan shall provide assurances that area agencies on aging will, to the maximum extent feasible, provide for the furnishing of services under this Act consistent with self-directed care.

“(28)(A) The plan shall include, at the election of the State, an assessment of how prepared

the State is, under the State’s statewide service delivery model, for a change in the number of older individuals during the 10-year period following the fiscal year for which the plan is submitted.

“(B) Such assessment may include—

“(i) the projected change in the number of older individuals in the State;

“(ii) an analysis of how such change may affect such individuals, including individuals with low incomes, individuals with great economic need, minority older individuals, older individuals residing in rural areas, and older individuals with limited English proficiency;

“(iii) an analysis of how the programs, policies, and services provided by the State can be improved, including coordinating with area agencies on aging, and how resource levels can be adjusted to meet the needs of the changing population of older individuals in the State; and

“(iv) an analysis of how the change in the number of individuals 85 years of age and older in the State is expected to affect the need for supportive services.”

SEC. 18. PAYMENTS.

Section 309(b)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3029(b)(2)) is amended by striking “the non-Federal share required prior to fiscal year 1981” and inserting “10 percent of the cost of the services specified in such section 304(d)(1)(D)”.

SEC. 19. NUTRITION SERVICES INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) CASH ONLY PROGRAM; AUTHORITY TO USE PROGRAM FUNDS TO PURCHASE FOOD THROUGH SCHOOL FOOD AUTHORITIES.—Section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) Each State agency shall promptly and equitably disburse amounts received under this subsection to recipients of grants and contracts.”

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by inserting “(including bonus commodities)” after “commodities”;

(B) in paragraph (2) by inserting “(including bonus commodities)” after “commodities”;

(C) in paragraph (3) by inserting “(including bonus commodities)” after “products”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Among the commodities delivered under this subsection, the Secretary of Agriculture shall give special emphasis to high protein foods. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary, is authorized to prescribe the terms and conditions respecting the donation of commodities under this subsection.”

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d)(1) Amounts provided under subsection (b) to State grantees and contractors, and to title VI grantees, shall be available only for the purchase by such entities of United States agricultural commodities and other foods for their respective nutrition projects, subject to paragraph (2).

“(2) Part or all of the amounts received by an entity specified in paragraph (1) may be used to pay a school food authority (as referred to under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C.1751 et seq.) to obtain United States agricultural commodities for such entity’s nutrition projects, in accordance with an agreement between the entity and the school food authority, under which such payments—

“(A) shall cover the cost of such commodities; and

“(B) may cover related expenses incurred by the school food authority, including the cost of transporting, distributing, processing, storing, and handling such commodities.”

(4) in subsection (e) by striking “2001” and inserting “2007”;

(5) in subsection (f)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services” and inserting “the Assistant Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture”, and

(B) by amending paragraphs (1) and (2) to read as follows:

“(1) school food authorities participating in programs authorized under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act within the geographic area served by each such State agency; and

“(2) the donated foods available to such State agencies, area agencies on aging, and providers under subsection (c).”.

SEC. 20. CONSUMER CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 315 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030c-2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking “provided that” and inserting “, and such contributions shall be encouraged for individuals whose self-declared income is at or above 125 percent of the poverty line and may be requested at contribution levels based on the actual cost of services, if”, and

(B) in paragraph (4)(E) by inserting “and to supplement (not supplant) funds received under this Act” after “given”,

(2) in subsection (c)(2) by striking “(with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)” and inserting “(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)”, and

(3) in subsection (d) by striking “with particular attention to low-income and minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas” and inserting “, with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas”.

SEC. 21. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND SENIOR CENTERS PROGRAM.

Section 321(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030d(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8) by inserting “(including mental health screening)” after “screening”,

(2) in paragraph (11) by inserting “(including assistive technology devices and assistive technology services)” after “services”,

(3) in paragraph (14)(B) by inserting “(including mental health)” after “health”,

(4) in paragraph (21)—

(A) by striking “school-age children” and inserting “students”, and

(B) by inserting “services to older individuals with limited English proficiency and” after “including”,

(5) in paragraph (22) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon,

(6) by redesignating paragraph (23) as paragraph (25), and

(7) by inserting after paragraph (22) the following:

“(23) services designed to support States, area agencies on aging, and local service providers carry out and coordinate, with respect to mental health services, activities including outreach, education, screening, and referral for treatment of older individuals;

(24) activities to promote and disseminate information about life-long learning programs, including opportunities for distance teaching; and”.

SEC. 22. NUTRITION SERVICE.

After the heading of part C of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030e-3030g-22), insert the following:

“SEC. 330. PURPOSE.

“It is the purpose of this part to promote socialization and the health and well-being of older individuals by assisting such individuals to gain access to disease prevention and health

promotion services (including information, nutrition services, and programs of physical activity) to delay the onset of health conditions resulting from poor nutritional health or sedentary behavior.”.

SEC. 23. CONGREGATE NUTRITION PROGRAM.

Section 331 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030e) is amended—

(1) by striking “projects—” and inserting “projects that—”,

(2) in paragraph (1) by striking “which,”,

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “which” the last place it appears, and

(B) by striking “and” at the end, and

(4) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) provide nutrition education, nutrition counseling, and other nutrition services, as appropriate, based on the needs of meal participants; and

“(4) may provide along with a meal described in (1), a multivitamin-mineral supplement as an addition to such meal.”.

SEC. 24. HOME DELIVERED NUTRITION SERVICES.

Section 336 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030f) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 336. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

“The Assistant Secretary shall establish and carry out a program to make grants to States under State plans approved under section 307 for the establishment and operation of nutrition projects for older individuals which provide, on 5 or more days a week (except in a rural area where such frequency is not feasible (as defined by the Assistant Secretary by rule) and a lesser frequency is approved by the State agency)—

“(1) at least 1 home delivered meal per day consisting of hot, cold, frozen, dried, canned, fresh, or supplemental foods and any additional meals that the recipient elects to provide; and

“(2) nutrition education, nutrition counseling, and other nutrition services as appropriate, based on the needs of meal recipients.”.

SEC. 25. CRITERIA.

Section 337 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030g) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 337. CRITERIA.

“The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with experts in the field of nutrition science, dietetics, meal planning and food service management, and aging, shall develop minimum criteria of efficiency and quality for the furnishing of home delivered meal services for projects described in section 336.”.

SEC. 26. NUTRITION.

Section 339 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030g-21) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) solicit the expertise of a dietitian or other individual with equivalent education and training in nutrition science, or if such an individual is not available, an individual with comparable expertise in the planning of nutritional services, and”, and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

“(i) comply with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans, published by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, and”, and

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking “daily recommended dietary allowances as” and inserting “dietary reference intakes”,

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting “joint” after “encourages”, and

(ii) by inserting “shared” after “promote”,

(C) by amending subparagraph (G) to read as follows:

“(G) ensures that local meal providers solicit the advice and expertise of—

“(i) a dietitian or, if a dietitian is not available, an individual with comparable expertise in the planning of nutrition and food services,

“(ii) meal participants, and

“(iii) other individuals knowledgeable with regard to the needs of older individuals.”.

(D) in subparagraph (H) by striking “and accompany”,

(E) by amending subparagraph (J) to read as follows:

“(J) provides for nutrition screening and nutrition education, and nutrition assessment and counseling if appropriate, and”, and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(K) encourages professionals who distribute nutrition assistance under subpart 2 to provide information to homebound seniors on how to get an influenza vaccination in their local areas.”.

SEC. 27. EVALUATION OF NUTRITION PROJECTS.

(a) STUDY.—The Assistant Secretary for Aging shall use funds allocated in section 206(g) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 to enter into a contract with the Food and Nutrition Board of the Institute of Medicine, for the purpose of establishing an independent panel of experts that will conduct an evidence-based evaluation of the nutrition projects authorized in such Act. Such study shall, to the extent data are available, include—

(1) an evaluation of the effect of nutrition projects authorized by such Act on—

(A) health status of participants, including nutritional status,

(B) prevention of participant hunger and food insecurity, and

(C) ability of participants to remain living independently,

(2) a cost-benefit analysis of nutrition projects authorized by such Act, including the potential to affect costs of Federal programs under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and

(3) recommendations for how nutrition projects authorized by such Act may be modified to improve the outcomes described in paragraph (1), including recommendations for improving the nutritional quality of meals and other potential strategies to improve the nutritional status of participants, including vitamin-mineral supplementation.

(b) TIMING.—The Institute of Medicine shall establish an independent panel of experts not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The panel shall submit to the Assistant Secretary the report described in subsection (a) not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Assistant Secretary shall submit a report on the findings of the evidence-based study described in such subsection to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate.

SEC. 28. IMPROVING INDOOR AIR QUALITY IN BUILDINGS WHERE SENIORS CONGREGATE.

Section 361 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030m) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) The Assistant Secretary shall work in consultation with qualified experts to provide information on methods of improving indoor air quality in buildings where seniors congregate.”.

SEC. 29. CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM DEFINITIONS.

Section 372 of the National Family Caregiver Support Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting “or who is an individual with a disability” after “age”,

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting “or an individual with Alzheimer’s disease or a related disorder with neurological and organic brain dysfunction” before the period at the end, and

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking “60” and inserting “55”.

SEC. 30. CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM.

Section 373 of the National Family Caregiver Support Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3) by striking “caregivers to assist” and all that follows through the end and inserting the following: “assist the caregivers in addressing caregiver issues related to

the areas of health, nutrition, and financial literacy, and in making decisions and solving problems relating to their caregiving roles;”;

(2) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) **USE OF VOLUNTEERS.**—In carrying out this subpart, each area agency on aging shall encourage the use of trained volunteers to expand the available services described in subsection (b) and shall, if possible, coordinate with volunteer programs (including programs administered by the Corporation for National Service) designed to provide training, placement, and stipends for volunteers in community service settings.”;

(3) in subsection (e)(3) by adding at the end the following: “The reports shall describe any mechanisms used in the State to provide family caregivers of an older individual and relative caregivers of a child or an adult child with a disability, information about and access to various services so that caregivers can better carry out their care responsibilities.”;

(4) in subsection (f)(1) by striking “2001 through 2005” and inserting “2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011”;

(5) in subsection (g)(2)(C) by inserting “of a child who is not more than 18 years of age” before the period at the end.

SEC. 31. ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

Section 376 of the National Family Caregiver Support Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s–12) is repealed.

SEC. 32. TITLE IV GRANT PROGRAMS.

Section 411 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (8) by striking “and” at the end,

(B) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (13), and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) planning activities to prepare communities for the aging of the population, which include—

“(A) efforts to assess the aging population;

“(B) activities to coordinate State and local agencies in order to meet the needs of older individuals; and

“(C) training and technical assistance to support States, area agencies on aging, and tribal organizations receiving a grant under title VI, engage in community planning activities; and

“(10) the development, implementation, and assessment of technology-based service models and best practices, to support the use of health monitoring and assessment technologies, communication devices, assistive technologies, and other technologies that may remotely connect family and professional caregivers to frail elderly residing in home- and community-based settings or rural areas;

“(11) conducting activities of national significance to promote quality and continuous improvement in the support provided to family and other informal caregivers of older individuals through activities that include program evaluation, training, technical assistance, and research, including—

“(A) intergenerational programs—

“(i) providing support to grandparents and other older relatives raising children (such as kinship navigator programs); and

“(ii) involving senior volunteers who provide support and information to families who have a child with a disability or chronic illness, or other families in need of such family support;

“(B) programs addressing unique issues faced by rural caregivers;

“(C) programs focusing on the needs of older individuals with cognitive impairment such as Alzheimer’s disease and other dementias, and their caregivers;

“(D) programs supporting caregivers in the role they play in health promotion and disease prevention;

“(12)(A) building public awareness of cognitive impairment such as Alzheimer’s disease

and related disorders with neurological and organic brain dysfunction, depression, and mental disorders; and

“(B) developing and enhancing multidisciplinary systems for the delivery of mental health screening and treatment referral services to improve access to community-based mental health services for older individuals; and”;

(2) in subsection (b) by striking “year” and all that follows through “years”, and inserting “years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011”.

SEC. 33. CAREER PREPARATION FOR THE FIELD OF AGING.

Section 412(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032a(a)) is amended by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) **GRANTS.**—The Assistant Secretary shall make grants to institutions of higher education, including historically Black colleges or universities, Hispanic serving institutions, and Hispanic Centers of Excellence in Applied Gerontology, to provide education and training that prepares students for careers in the field of aging.”.

SEC. 34. HEALTH CARE SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 414 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting “mental health services,” after “care,”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(B)(i) by inserting “mental health,” after “health.”.

SEC. 35. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS FOR MULTIGENERATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

Section 417(c)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032f(c)(2)) is amended by striking “(with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)” and inserting “(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)”.

SEC. 36. NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS.

Section 418(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032g(a)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by inserting “(including mental health)” after “problems”.

SEC. 37. MULTIDISCIPLINARY CENTERS.

Section 419 of the Older Americans Act of 1995 (42 U.S.C. 3032h) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting “diverse populations of older individuals residing in urban communities,” after “minority populations,”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (E) by inserting “, including information about best practices in long-term care service delivery, housing, and transportation” before the semicolon at the end,

(B) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) by striking “consultation and”;

(ii) by inserting “and other technical assistance” after “information”; and

(iii) by striking “and” at the end,

(C) in subparagraph (G) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) provide training and technical assistance to support the provision of community-based mental health services for older individuals.”.

SEC. 38. RESPONSIBILITIES OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

Section 432(c)(2)(B) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3033a(c)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting “, including preparing an analysis of such services, projects, and programs, and of how the evaluation relates to improvements in such services, projects, and programs and in the strategic plan of the Administration” before the period at the end.

SEC. 39. COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT-BASED TRAINING FOR OLDER AMERICANS.

Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“TITLE V—COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT-BASED TRAINING FOR OLDER AMERICANS

“SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

“This title may be cited as the ‘Older American Community Service Employment-Based Training Act’.

“SEC. 502. OLDER AMERICAN COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT-BASED TRAINING PROGRAM.

“(a) To foster individual economic self-sufficiency and to increase the number of individuals who may enjoy the benefits of unsubsidized employment in both the public and private sectors, the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the ‘Secretary’) may establish an older American community service employment-based training program to foster and promote useful part-time public and private-sector employment-based training opportunities for unemployed low-income eligible individuals who have poor employment prospects and to provide vital social and human services to communities by providing work experience to eligible individuals in public agencies, community-based and faith-based organizations.

“(b)(1) To carry out this title, the Secretary may make grants to public and nonprofit agencies and organizations, agencies of a State, and tribal organizations to carry out the program established under subsection (a). Such grants may provide for the payment of costs, as provided in subsection (c), of projects developed by such organizations and agencies in cooperation with the Secretary in order to make such program effective or to supplement such program. No payment shall be made by the Secretary toward the cost of any project established or administered by any organization or agency unless the Secretary determines that such project—

“(A) shall provide authorized activities only for eligible individuals, and that not less than 50 percent of hours worked (in the aggregate) shall be in community service employment-based training provided by a grantee in a program year;

“(B)(i) shall provide authorized activities for eligible individuals in the community in which such individuals reside, or in nearby communities, and that not less than 50 percent of hours worked (in the aggregate) shall be in community service employment-based training provided by a grantee in a program year; or

“(ii) if such project is carried out by a tribal organization that receives a grant under this subsection or receives assistance from a State that receives a grant under this subsection, will provide authorized activities, including community service employment-based training for such individuals, including those who are Indians residing on an Indian reservation, as defined in section 2601(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501(2));

“(C) together with all the projects carried out under this title in each program year by a grantee, will not provide for participation under this title by eligible individuals (in the aggregate) for an average period per capita that exceeds 24 months (whether or not consecutive) during the period including the program year for which the determination under this subparagraph is made and the previous program years in which such grantee carried out projects under this title;

“(D) will provide employment-based training to eligible individuals in service related to publicly owned and operated facilities and projects, or projects sponsored by profitmaking or nonprofit organizations (excluding political parties exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), but excluding projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of any facility used or to

be used as a place for sectarian religious instruction or worship;

“(E) will contribute to the general welfare of the community, which may include support for children, youth, and families;

“(F) is intended to result in unsubsidized employment for eligible individuals after completion of such program;

“(G)(i) will not reduce the number of job opportunities or vacancies that would otherwise be available to individuals not participating in such program;

“(ii) will not displace currently employed workers (including partial displacement, such as a reduction in the hours of non-overtime work, wages, or employment benefits);

“(iii) will not impair existing contracts or result in the substitution of Federal funds for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed; and

“(iv) will not place an eligible individual in employment-based training to perform work the same or substantially the same work as that performed by any other individual who is on lay-off;

“(H) will coordinate with training and other services provided under title I of the Workforce Investment Act, including utilizing the One-Stop delivery system to recruit eligible individuals to ensure that the maximum number of eligible individuals will have an opportunity to participate in the project;

“(I) will include such training (such as community service employment-based training, work experience, on-the-job training, and classroom training) as may be necessary to make the most effective use of the skills and talents of those individuals who are participating;

“(J) will ensure that safe and healthy conditions of the employment-based training facility or other training facility will be provided, and will ensure that individuals employed in community service and other jobs assisted under this title shall be paid wages that shall not be lower than whichever is the highest of—

“(i) the minimum wage that would be applicable to the employee under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, if section 6(a)(1) of such Act applied to the participant and if the participant were not exempt under section 13 thereof;

“(ii) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment; or

“(iii) the prevailing rates of pay for individuals employed in similar occupations by the same employer;

“(K) will be established or administered with the advice of persons competent in the field of service in which job training is being provided, and of persons who are knowledgeable about the needs of older individuals;

“(L) will authorize payment for necessary supportive services costs, (including transportation costs) of eligible individuals that may be incurred in training in any project funded under this title, in accordance with rules issued by the Secretary;

“(M) will ensure that, to the extent feasible, such project will serve the needs of minority, limited English-speaking, and Indian eligible individuals, and eligible individuals who have the greatest economic need, at least in proportion to their numbers in the State and take into consideration their rates of poverty and unemployment;

“(N)(i) will prepare an assessment of the participants' skills and talents and their needs for services, except to the extent such project has, for the participant involved, recently prepared an assessment of such skills and talents, and such needs, pursuant to another employment or training program (such as a program under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), or part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.);

“(ii) will provide training and employment counseling to eligible individuals based on strat-

egies that identify appropriate employment objectives and the need for supportive services, developed as a result of the assessment and service strategy provided for in clause (i), and provide other appropriate information regarding such program; and

“(iii) will provide counseling to participants on their progress in meeting such objectives and satisfying their need for supportive services;

“(O) will provide appropriate services for participants through the One-Stop delivery system as established under section 134(c) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(c)), and will be involved in the planning and operations of such system pursuant to a memorandum of understanding with the local workforce investment board in accordance with section 121(c) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2841(c));

“(P) will post in such project workplace a notice, and will make available to each person associated with such project a written explanation—

“(i) clarifying the law with respect to political activities allowable and unallowable under chapter 15 of title 5, United States Code, applicable to the project and to each category of individuals associated with such project; and

“(ii) containing the address and telephone number of the Inspector General of the Department of Labor, to whom questions regarding the application of such chapter may be addressed;

“(Q) will provide to the Secretary the description and information described in—

“(i) paragraph (8), relating to coordination with other Federal programs, of section 112(b) of the Workforce and Investment Act of 1998; and

“(ii) paragraph (14), relating to implementation of One-Stop delivery systems, of section 112(b) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998; and

“(R) will ensure that entities that carry out activities under the project (including State agencies, local entities, subgrantees, subcontractors) and affiliates of such entities receive an amount of the administrative cost allocation determined by the Secretary to be sufficient.

“(2) The Secretary may establish, issue, and amend such regulations as may be necessary to effectively carry out this title.

“(3)(A) An assessment and service strategy required by paragraph (1) to be prepared for an eligible individual shall satisfy any condition for an assessment and service strategy or individual employment plan for an adult participant under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.), in order to determine whether such eligible individual also qualifies for intensive or training services described in section 134(d) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2864(d)).

“(B) An assessment and service strategy or individual employment plan prepared under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.) for an eligible individual may be used to comply with the requirement specified in subparagraph (A).

“(c)(1) The Secretary may pay a share not to exceed 90 percent of the cost of any project for which a grant is made under subsection (b), except that the Secretary may pay all of such cost if such project is—

“(A) an emergency or disaster project; or

“(B) a project located in an economically depressed area, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(2) The non-Federal share shall be in cash or in kind. In determining the amount of the non-Federal share, the Secretary may attribute fair market value to services and facilities contributed from non-Federal sources.

“(3) Of the amount to be paid under this subsection by the Secretary for a project, not to exceed 13.5 percent shall be available for any fiscal year to pay the administrative costs of such project, except that—

“(A) the Secretary may increase the amount available to pay administrative costs to an

amount not to exceed 15 percent of the cost of such project if the Secretary determines, based on information submitted by the grantee under subsection (b), that such increase is necessary to carry out such project; and

“(B) if the grantee under subsection (b) demonstrates to the Secretary that—

“(i) major administrative cost increases are being incurred in necessary program components, including liability insurance, payments for workers' compensation, costs associated with achieving unsubsidized placement goals, and other operation requirements imposed by the Secretary;

“(ii) the number of positions in the project or the number of minority eligible individuals participating in the project will decline if the amount available to pay administrative costs is not increased; or

“(iii) the size of the project is so small that the amount of administrative costs incurred to carry out the project necessarily exceeds 13.5 percent of the cost of such project; the Secretary shall increase the amount available for such fiscal year to pay administrative costs to an amount not to exceed 15 percent of the cost of such project.

“(4) Administrative costs are the costs, both personnel and non-personnel and both direct and indirect, associated with the following:

“(A) The costs of performing general administrative functions and of providing for the coordination of functions, such as—

“(i) accounting, budgeting, financial, cash management and related data processing;

“(ii) quality assurance;

“(iii) preparing program plans;

“(iv) procurement and purchasing;

“(v) property management;

“(vi) personnel management, including personnel administration, administration of affirmative action plans, and training and staff development;

“(vii) administrative salaries, including clerical and other support staff salaries;

“(viii) payroll functions;

“(ix) coordinating the resolution of findings arising from audits, reviews, investigations, and incident reports;

“(x) audit;

“(xi) general legal services;

“(xii) developing systems and procedures, including information systems, required for administrative functions;

“(xiii) preparing reports; and

“(xiv) other activities necessary for the general administration of government funds and associated programs.

“(B) The costs of performing oversight and monitoring responsibilities.

“(C) The costs of goods and services required for administrative functions of such program, including goods and services such as rental or purchase of equipment, utilities, office supplies, postage, and rental and maintenance of office space.

“(D) The travel costs incurred for official business in carrying out such program, excluding travel costs related to providing services.

“(E) The costs of information systems related to personnel, procurement, purchasing, property management, accounting, and payroll systems), including the purchase, systems development, and operating costs of such systems.

“(F) The costs of technical assistance, professional organization membership dues, removal of architectural barriers, operating and maintaining assistive technology, and evaluating program results against stated objectives.

“(5) To the extent practicable, an entity that carries out a project under this title shall provide for the payment of the expenses described in paragraph (4) from non-Federal sources.

“(6)(A) Amounts made available for a project under this title that are not used to pay for the administrative costs shall be used to pay for the costs of programmatic activities, including—

“(i) participant wages, such benefits as are required by law (such as workers compensation or

unemployment compensation), the costs of physical examinations, compensation for scheduled work hours during which an employer is closed for a Federal holiday, and necessary sick leave that is not part of an accumulated sick leave program, except that no amounts provided under this title may be used to pay the cost of pension benefits, annual leave, accumulated sick leave, or bonuses;

“(ii) participant training (including the payment of reasonable costs of instructors, classroom rental, training supplies, materials, equipment, and tuition) which may be provided prior to or subsequent to placement and which may be provided on the job, in a classroom setting or pursuant to other appropriate arrangements;

“(iii) job placement assistance, including job development and job search assistance;

“(iv) participant supportive services to enable a participant to successfully participate in a project under this title, which may include the payment of reasonable costs of transportation, special job-related or personal counseling, incidentals (such as work shoes, badges, uniforms, eyeglasses, and tools), child and adult care, temporary shelter, and follow-up services; and

“(v) outreach, recruitment, and selection, intake, orientation, and assessments.

“(B) Not less than 65 percent of the funds made available under a grant made under this title (excluding a grant made under subsection (d)) shall be used to pay wages and benefits for eligible individuals who are employed under projects carried out under this title.

“(d) PILOT, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATION PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall use funds reserved under section 506(a)(1) to carry out demonstration projects, pilot projects, and evaluation projects, for the purpose of developing and implementing techniques and approaches, and demonstrating the effectiveness of the specialized methods, in addressing the employment and training needs of eligible individuals. Such projects may include—

“(1) activities linking businesses and eligible individuals, including assistance to participants transitioning from subsidized activities to private-sector employment; and

“(2) demonstration projects and pilot projects designed to—

“(A) attract more eligible individuals into the labor force;

“(B) improve the provision of services to eligible individuals under the One-Stop delivery system established in accordance with title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998;

“(C) enhance the technological skills of eligible individuals; and

“(D) provide incentives to grantees under this title for exemplary performance and incentives to businesses to promote their participation in the program under this title;

“(3) demonstration projects and pilot projects, as described in paragraph (2), for older workers only if such demonstration projects and pilot projects are designed to assist in developing and implementing techniques and approaches in addressing the employment and training needs of eligible individuals;

“(4) training and technical assistance to support any project funded under this title;

“(5) dissemination of best practices; and

“(6) evaluation of the activities authorized under this title.

“SEC. 503. ADMINISTRATION.

“(a) STATE PLAN.—

“(1) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUBMITS PLAN.—For a State to be eligible to receive an allotment under section, 506, the chief executive officer of the State shall submit to the Secretary for consideration and approval, a single State plan (referred to in this title as the ‘State plan’) that outlines a 3-year strategy for the statewide provision of training and related activities for eligible individuals under this title. The plan shall contain such provisions as the Secretary

may require, consistent with this title, including a description of the process used to ensure the participation of individuals described in paragraph (2).

“(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In developing the State plan prior to its submission to the Secretary, the chief executive officer of the State shall seek the advice and recommendations of—

“(A) individuals representing the State agency and the area agencies on aging in the State, and the State and local workforce investment boards established under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.);

“(B) individuals representing public and non-profit private agencies and organizations providing employment services, including each grantee operating a project under this title in the State; and

“(C) individuals representing social service organizations providing services to older individuals, grantees under title III of this Act, affected communities, unemployed older individuals, community-based organizations serving the needs of older individuals, business organizations, and labor organizations.

“(3) COMMENTS.—Any State plan submitted by the chief executive officer in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be accompanied by copies of public comments relating to the plan received pursuant to paragraph (4) and a summary thereof.

“(4) PLAN PROVISIONS.—The State plan shall identify and address—

“(A) the relationship that the number of eligible individuals in each area bears to the total number of eligible individuals, respectively, in the State;

“(B) the relative distribution of eligible individuals residing in rural and urban areas in the State; and

“(C) the relative distribution of—

“(i) eligible individuals who are individuals with greatest economic need;

“(ii) eligible individuals who are minority individuals, including individuals who are limited English proficient; and

“(iii) eligible individuals who are individuals with greatest social need;

“(D) the current and projected employment opportunities in the State, by occupation, and the type of skills possessed by local eligible individuals;

“(E) the localities and populations for which projects of the type authorized by this title are most needed; and

“(F) plans for facilitating the coordination of activities of grantees in the State under this title with activities carried out in the State under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998.

“(5) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATIONS ON GRANT PROPOSALS.—Before a proposal for a grant under this title for any fiscal year is submitted to the Secretary, the chief executive officer of each State in which projects are proposed to be conducted under such grant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to submit recommendations to the Secretary—

“(A) regarding the anticipated effect of each such proposal upon the overall distribution of enrollment positions under this title in the State (including such distribution among urban and rural areas), taking into account the total number of positions to be provided by all grantees in the State;

“(B) any recommendations for redistribution of positions to under served areas as vacancies occur in previously encumbered positions in other areas; and

“(C) in the case of any increase in funding that may be available for use in the State under this title for any fiscal year, any recommendations for distribution of newly available positions in excess of those available during the preceding year to underserved areas.

“(6) DISRUPTIONS.—In developing plans and considering recommendations under this subsection, disruptions in the provision of services for current participants shall be avoided to the greatest possible extent.

“(7) DETERMINATION; REVIEW.—

“(A) DETERMINATION.—In order to effectively carry out this title, each State shall make the State plan available for public comment. The Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary, shall review the plan and make a written determination with findings and a decision regarding the plan.

“(B) REVIEW.—The Secretary may review, on the Secretary’s own initiative or at the request of any public or private agency or organization or of any agency of the State, the distribution of projects and services under this title in the State including the distribution between urban and rural areas in the State. For each proposed reallocation of projects or services in a State, the Secretary shall give notice and opportunity for public comment.

“(8) EXEMPTION.—The grantees that serve eligible individuals who are older Indians with funds reserved under section 506(a)(3) may not be required to participate in the State planning processes described in this section but will collaborate with the Secretary to develop a plan for projects and services to eligible individuals who are Indians.

“(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—

“(1) The Secretary and the Assistant Secretary shall coordinate the program carried out under this title with programs carried out under other titles of this Act, to increase job opportunities available to older individuals.

“(2) The Secretary shall coordinate programs carried out under this title with the program carried out under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, the Community Services Block Grant Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.), and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4950 et seq.). The Secretary shall coordinate the administration of this title with the administration of other titles of this Act by the Assistant Secretary to increase the likelihood that eligible individuals for whom employment opportunities under this title are available and who need services under such titles receive such services. Funds appropriated to carry out this title may not be used to carry out any program under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, the Community Services Block Grant Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998, the National and Community Service Act of 1990, or the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973. The preceding sentence shall not be construed to prohibit carrying out projects under this title jointly with programs, projects, or activities under any Act specified in such sentence, or from carrying out section 512.

“(3) The Secretary shall distribute to grantees under this title, for distribution to program participants, and at no cost to grantees or participants, informational materials developed and supplied by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and other appropriate Federal agencies that the Secretary determines are designed to help participants identify age discrimination and to understand their rights under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967.

“(c) In carrying out this title, the Secretary may use, with their consent, the services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of Federal and other agencies with or without reimbursement, and on a similar basis to cooperate with other public and private agencies and instrumentalities in the use of services, equipment, and facilities.

“(d) Payments under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

“(e) The Secretary shall not delegate any function of the Secretary under this title to any other Federal officer or entity.

“(f)(1) The Secretary shall monitor projects for which grants are made under this title to determine whether the grantees are complying with rules and regulations issued to carry out this title (including the statewide planning, consultation, and coordination requirements of this title).

“(2) Each grantee that receives funds under this title shall comply with the applicable uniform cost principles and appropriate administrative requirements for grants and contracts that are applicable to the type of entity that receives funds, as issued as circulars or rules of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(3) Each grantee described in paragraph (2) shall prepare and submit a report in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require regarding activities carried out under this title.

“(4) Each grantee described in paragraph (2) shall keep records that—

“(A) are sufficient to permit the preparation of reports required by this title;

“(B) are sufficient to permit the tracing of funds to a level of expenditure adequate to ensure that the funds have not been spent unlawfully; and

“(C) contain any other information that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(g) The Secretary shall establish by rule and implement a process to evaluate, in accordance with section 513, the performance of projects and services carried out under this title. The Secretary shall report to the Congress, and make available to the public, the results of each such evaluation and shall use such evaluation to improve services delivered by, or the operation of, projects carried out under this title.

“SEC. 504. PARTICIPANTS NOT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

“(a) Eligible individuals who are participants in authorized activities in any project funded under this title shall not be considered to be Federal employees as a result of such participation and shall not be subject to part III of title 5, United States Code.

“(b) No grant, subgrant, contract or subcontract shall be entered into under this title with an entity who is, or whose employees are, under State law, exempted from operation of the State workers' compensation law, generally applicable to employees unless the entity shall undertake to provide either through insurance by a recognized carrier or by self-insurance, as authorized by State law, that the persons employed under the grant, contract, subgrant, or subcontract shall enjoy workers' compensation coverage equal to that provided by law for covered employment.

“SEC. 505. INTERAGENCY COOPERATION.

“(a) The Secretary shall consult with and obtain the written views of the Assistant Secretary before issuing rules and before establishing general policy in the administration of this title.

“(b) The Secretary shall consult and cooperate with the Director of the Office of Community Services, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the heads of other Federal agencies that carry out related programs, in order to achieve optimal coordination with such other programs. In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall promote programs or projects of a similar nature. Each Federal agency shall cooperate with the Secretary in disseminating information relating to the availability of assistance under this title and in promoting the identification and interests of individuals eligible for employment in projects assisted under this title.

“(c)(1) The Secretary shall promote and coordinate carrying out projects under this title jointly with programs, projects, or activities carried out under other Acts, especially activities provided under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), including activities provided through One-Stop delivery systems established under section 134(c) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2864(c)), that provide training and employment opportunities to eligible individuals.

“(2) The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Education to promote and coordinate carrying out projects under this title jointly with workforce investment activities in which eligible individuals may participate that are carried out under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998.

“SEC. 506. DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE.

“(a) RESERVATIONS.—

“(1) RESERVATION FOR NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Of the funds appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year, the Secretary may first reserve up to 1.5 percent to carry out demonstration projects, pilot projects, and evaluation projects under section 502(d).

“(2) RESERVATION FOR TERRITORIES.—Of the funds appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve up to 0.75 percent, of which—

“(A) Guam, American Samoa, and the United States Virgin Islands shall each receive 30 percent of the funds so reserved; and

“(B) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands shall receive 10 percent of the funds so reserved.

“(3) RESERVATION FOR ORGANIZATIONS.—Of the funds appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve such amount as may be necessary to make national grants to public or nonprofit national Indian aging organizations with the ability to provide authorized activities for eligible individuals who are Indians and to national public or nonprofit Pacific Island and Asian American aging organizations with the ability to provide authorized activities for eligible individuals who are Pacific Island and Asian Americans.

“(b) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—The allotment for each State shall be the sum of the amounts allotted for national grants in such State under subsection (d) and for the grant to such State under subsection (e).

“(c) DIVISION BETWEEN NATIONAL GRANTS AND GRANTS TO STATES.—The funds appropriated to carry out this title for any fiscal year that remain after amounts are reserved under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), shall be divided by the Secretary between national grants and grants to States as follows:

“(1) RESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) The Secretary shall reserve the amount of funds necessary to maintain the fiscal year 2006 level of activities supported by grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary, and the fiscal year 2006 level of activities supported by State grantees under this title, in proportion to their respective fiscal year 2006 levels of activities.

“(B) If in any fiscal year for which the funds appropriated to carry out this title are insufficient to satisfy the requirement specified in subparagraph (A), then the amount described in subparagraph (A) shall be reduced proportionally.

“(2) FUNDING IN EXCESS OF FISCAL YEAR 2006 LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) UP TO \$35,000,000.—The amount of funds remaining after the application of paragraph (1), but not to exceed \$35,000,000, shall be divided so that 75 percent shall be provided to State grantees and 25 percent shall be provided to grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary.

“(B) OVER \$35,000,000.—The amount of funds remaining (if any) after the application of subparagraph (A) shall be divided so that 50 percent shall be provided to State grantees and 50 percent shall be provided to grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary.

“(d) ALLOTMENTS FOR NATIONAL GRANTS.—From funds available under subsection (c) for national grants, the Secretary shall allot for public and nonprofit private agency and organization grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary in

each State, an amount that bears the same ratio to such funds as the product of the number of individuals 55 years of age or older in the State and the allotment percentage of such State bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all States, except as follows:

“(1) MINIMUM ALLOTMENT.—No State shall be provided an amount under this subsection that is less than ½ of 1 percent of the amount provided under subsection (c) for public and nonprofit private agency and organization grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary in all of the States.

“(2) HOLD HARMLESS.—If the amount provided under subsection (c) is—

“(A) equal to or less than the amount necessary to maintain the fiscal year 2006 level of activities, allotments for grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary in each State shall be proportional to their fiscal year 2006 level of activities; or

“(B) greater than the amount necessary to maintain the fiscal year 2006 level of activities, no State shall be provided a percentage increase above the fiscal year 2006 level of activities for grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary in the State that is less than 30 percent of such percentage increase above the fiscal year 2006 level of activities for public and nonprofit private agency and organization grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary in all of the States.

“(3) REDUCTION.—Allotments for States not affected by paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) of this subsection shall be reduced proportionally to satisfy the conditions in such paragraphs.

“(e) ALLOTMENTS FOR GRANTS TO STATES.—From the amount provided for grants to States under subsection (c), the Secretary shall allot for the State grantee in each State an amount that bears the same ratio to such amount as the product of the number of individuals 55 years of age or older in the State and the allotment percentage of such State bears to the sum of the corresponding product for all States, except as follows:

“(1) MINIMUM ALLOTMENT.—No State shall be provided an amount under this subsection that is less than ½ of 1 percent of the amount provided under subsection (c) for State grantees in all of the States.

“(2) HOLD HARMLESS.—If the amount provided under subsection (c) is—

“(A) equal to or less than the amount necessary to maintain the fiscal year 2006 level of activities, allotments for State grantees in each State shall be proportional to their fiscal year 2006 level of activities; or

“(B) greater than the amount necessary to maintain the fiscal year 2006 level of activities, no State shall be provided a percentage increase above the fiscal year 2006 level of activities for State grantees in the State that is less than 30 percent of such percentage increase above the fiscal year 2006 level of activities for State grantees in all of the States.

“(3) REDUCTION.—Allotments for States not affected by paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) of this subsection shall be reduced proportionally to satisfy the conditions in such paragraphs.

“(f) ALLOTMENT PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subsections (d) and (e)—

“(1) the allotment percentage of each State shall be 100 percent less than percentage that bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the United States, except that—

“(A) the allotment percentage shall be not more than 75 percent and not less than 33 percent; and

“(B) the allotment percentage for the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be 75 percent;

“(2) the number of individuals 55 years of age or older in any State and in all States, and the per capita income in any State and in all States, shall be determined by the Secretary on the

basis of the most satisfactory data available to the Secretary; and

“(3) for the purpose of determining the allotment percentage, the term ‘United States’ means the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(1) COST PER AUTHORIZED POSITION.—The term ‘cost per authorized position’ means the sum of—

“(A) the hourly minimum wage rate specified in section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)), multiplied by the number of hours equal to the product of 21 hours and 52 weeks;

“(B) an amount equal to 11 percent of the amount specified under subparagraph (A), for the purpose of covering Federal payments for fringe benefits; and

“(C) an amount determined by the Secretary, for the purpose of covering Federal payments for the remainder of all other program and administrative costs.

“(2) FISCAL YEAR 2006 LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES.—The term ‘fiscal year 2006 level of activities’ means—

“(A) with respect to public and nonprofit private agency and organization grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary, their level of activities for fiscal year 2006; and

“(B) with respect to State grantees, their level of activities for fiscal year 2006.

“(3) GRANTS TO STATES.—The term ‘grants to States’ means grants made under this title by the Secretary to the States.

“(4) LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES.—The term ‘level of activities’ means the number of authorized positions multiplied by the cost per authorized position.

“(5) NATIONAL GRANTS.—The term ‘national grants’ means grants made under this title by the Secretary to public and nonprofit private agency and organization grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary.

“(6) STATE.—The term ‘State’ does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands.

“SEC. 507. EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.

“(a) INTERSTATE ALLOCATION.—In making grants under section 506, the Secretary shall ensure, to the extent feasible, an equitable distribution of activities under such grants, in the aggregate, among the States, taking into account the needs of underserved States.

“(b) INTRASTATE ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated for projects within each State under section 506 shall be allocated among areas in the State in an equitable manner, taking into consideration the State priorities set out in the State plan in effect under section 503(a).

“SEC. 508. REPORT.

“To carry out the Secretary’s responsibilities for reporting in section 503(g), the Secretary shall require the State agency for each State that receives funds under this title to prepare and submit a report at the beginning of each fiscal year on such State’s compliance with section 507(b). Such report shall include the names and geographic location of all projects assisted under this title and carried out in the State and the amount allocated to each such project under section 506.

“SEC. 509. EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE AND FEDERAL HOUSING AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS.

“Funds received by eligible individuals from projects carried out under the program established in this title shall not be considered to be income of such individuals for purposes of determining the eligibility of such individuals, or of any other individuals, to participate in any housing program for which Federal funds may be available or for any income determination under the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

“SEC. 510. ELIGIBILITY FOR WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES.

“Eligible individuals under this title may be considered by local workforce investment boards established under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to satisfy the requirements for receiving services under such title I that are applicable to adults.

“SEC. 511. TREATMENT OF ASSISTANCE.

“Assistance provided under this title shall not be considered to be financial assistance described in section 245A(h)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255A(h)(1)(A)).

“SEC. 512. COORDINATION WITH THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1998.

“(a) PARTNERS.—Grantees under this title shall be One-Stop partners as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B)(vi) of section 121(b)(1) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2841(b)(1)) in the One-Stop delivery system established under section 134(c) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2864(c)) for the appropriate local workforce investment areas, and shall carry out the responsibilities relating to such partners.

“(b) COORDINATION.—In local workforce investment areas where more than 1 grantee under this title provides services, the grantees shall—

“(1) coordinate their activities related to the One-Stop delivery system; and

“(2) shall be signatories of the memorandum of understanding established under section 121(c) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2841(c)).

“SEC. 513. PERFORMANCE.

“(a) MEASURES.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF MEASURES.—The Secretary shall establish, in consultation with grantees, subgrantees, and host agencies under this title, States, older individuals, area agencies on aging, and other organizations serving older individuals, performance measures for each grantee for projects and services carried out under this title.

“(2) CONTENT.—

“(A) COMPOSITION OF MEASURES.—The performance measures established by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (1) shall consist of—

“(i) core indicators of performance specified in subsection (b)(1) and the expected levels of performance applicable to each core indicator of performance, and

“(ii) additional indicators of performance specified in subsection (b)(2).

“(B) CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.—The measures described in subparagraph (A)(i) shall be designed to promote continuous improvement in performance.

“(C) EXPECTED LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary and each grantee shall reach agreement on the expected levels of performance for each program year for each of the core indicators of performance specified in subsection (b)(1). The agreement shall take into account the factors described in subparagraphs (B) and (D) and other appropriate factors as determined by the Secretary, and shall be consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (E). Funds under the grant may not be awarded until such agreement is reached.

“(D) ADJUSTMENT.—The expected levels of performance described in subparagraph (C) applicable to a grantee shall be adjusted after the agreement under subparagraph (C) has been reached only with respect to the following factors:

“(i) High rates of unemployment or of poverty or welfare participation, in the areas served by a grantee, relative to other areas of the State or Nation.

“(ii) Significant downturns in the areas served by the grantee or in the national economy.

“(iii) Significant numbers or proportions of participants with 1 or more barriers to employment served by a grantee relative to grantees serving other areas of the State or Nation.

“(iv) Changes in Federal, State, or local minimum wage requirements.

“(E) PLACEMENT.—

“(i) LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE.—For all grantees, the Secretary shall establish a level of performance of not less than the percentage specified in clause (ii) (adjusted in accordance with subparagraph (D)) for the entry into unsubsidized employment core indicator of performance described in subsection (b)(1)(A). If a grantee achieved a level of performance less than the percentage specified in such clause for the preceding fiscal year for which results are available before the enactment of the Senior Independence Act of 2006, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance to assist such grantee to achieve the applicable percentage specified in such clause.

“(ii) REQUIRED PLACEMENT PERCENTAGES.—The minimum percentage for the entry into unsubsidized employment described in subsection (b)(1)(A) is—

“(I) 22 percent in fiscal year 2007;

“(II) 24 percent in fiscal year 2008;

“(III) 26 percent in fiscal year 2009;

“(IV) 28 percent in fiscal year 2010; and

“(V) 30 percent in fiscal year 2011.

“(3) PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF GRANTEES.—The Secretary shall annually establish national performance measures for each grantee under this title, which shall be applicable to the grantee without regard to whether such grantee operates such program directly or through contracts, grants, or agreements with other entities. The measures shall include the core indicators of performance and expected level of performance for each such indicator, and the additional indicators of performance. In addition, the Secretary shall annually publish the actual performance of each grantee with respect to—

“(A) the levels achieved for each of the core indicators of performance, compared to expected levels of performance under paragraph (2)(C) (including any adjustments to such levels made in accordance with to paragraph (2)(D)); and

“(B) the levels achieved for each of the additional indicators of performance.

“(4) LIMITATION.—An agreement to be evaluated on the performance measures shall be a requirement for application for, and a condition of, all grants authorized by this title.

“(b) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

“(1) CORE INDICATORS.—The core indicators of performance described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i) shall consist of—

“(A) entry into unsubsidized employment;

“(B) retention in unsubsidized employment for 6 months;

“(C) earnings; and

“(D) hours (in the aggregate) of community service employment-based training pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B)(I) of section 502(b)(1).

“(2) ADDITIONAL INDICATORS.—The additional indicators of performance described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(ii) shall consist of—

“(A) retention in unsubsidized employment for 1 year;

“(B) the number of eligible individuals served, including the number of participating individuals described in section 516(2)(A)(ii), and

“(C) any other indicators of performance that the Secretary determines to be appropriate to evaluate services and performance.

“(c) DEFINITIONS OF INDICATORS.—The Secretary, after consultation with national and State grantees, representatives of business and labor organizations, and providers of services, shall issue rules that define the indicators of performance described in subsection (b).

“(d) CORRECTIVE EFFORTS.—

“(1) NATIONAL GRANTEES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the end of each program year, the Secretary shall determine if a national grantee awarded a grant under section 514 has met the expected levels of performance established under subsection (a)(2)(c) (including any adjustments

to such levels made in accordance with to subsection (a)(2)(D)) for the core indicators of performance described in subsection (b)(1).

“(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that a grantee fails to meet the expected levels of performance described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide technical assistance and require such grantee to submit a corrective action plan not later than 160 days after the end of the program year.

“(ii) CONTENT.—The plan submitted under subparagraph (A) shall detail the steps the grantee will take to meet the national performance measures in the next program year.

“(2) STATE GRANTEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the end of the program year, the Secretary shall determine if a State grantee allotted funds under section 506(e) has met the expected levels of performance established under subsection (a)(2)(C) (including any adjustments to such levels made in accordance with to subsection (a)(2)(D)) for the core indicators of performance described in subsection (b)(1).

“(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN.—If a State fails to meet the levels of performance described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide technical assistance and require the State to submit a corrective action plan not later than 160 days after the end of the program year.

“(C) CONTENT.—The plan described in subparagraph (B) shall detail the steps the State will take to meet the standards.

“(D) FAILURE TO MEET PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR THE THIRD YEAR.—If the State fails to meet the levels of performance described in subparagraph (A) for a third consecutive program year, the Secretary shall provide for the conduct by the State of a competition to award the funds allocated to the State for the first full program year following the Secretary's determination that the State has not met the performance measures.

“SEC. 514. COMPETITIVE REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO GRANT AWARDS.

“(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

“(1) INITIAL APPROVAL OF GRANT APPLICATIONS.—From the funds available for national grants under section 506(d), the Secretary shall award grants to eligible applicants to carry out projects under this title for a period of 3 years through a competitive process except as provided in paragraph (2).

“(2) CONTINUATION OF APPROVAL BASED ON PERFORMANCE.—If the recipient of a grant made under paragraph (1) satisfies the requirements of section 513 during such 3-year period (and the succeeding 1-year period for which any grant is made under this paragraph) with respect to a project, the Secretary may award grants to such recipient to continue such project beyond such 3-year period for not to exceed 2 successive 1-year periods without regard to such process.

“(b) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—An applicant shall be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a) in accordance with section 502(b)(1), and subsections (c) and (d).

“(c) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall select the eligible applicants to receive grants under subsection (a) based on the following:

“(1) The applicant's ability to administer a program that serves the greatest number of eligible individuals, giving particular consideration to individuals with greatest economic need, greatest social need, poor employment history or prospects, and over the age of 65.

“(2) The applicant's ability to administer a program that provides employment for eligible individuals in the communities in which such individuals reside, or in nearby communities, that will contribute to the general welfare of the community.

“(3) The applicant's ability to administer a program that moves eligible individuals into unsubsidized employment.

“(4) The applicant's prior performance, if any, in meeting performance measures under this title and under other Federal or State programs.

“(5) The applicant's ability to move individuals with multiple barriers to employment into unsubsidized employment.

“(6) The applicant's ability to coordinate with other organizations at the State and local level.

“(7) The applicant's plan for fiscal management of the program to be administered with funds received under this section.

“(8) Any additional criteria that the Secretary considers to be appropriate in order to minimize disruption for current participants.

“(d) RESPONSIBILITY TESTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before final selection of a grantee, the Secretary shall conduct a review of available records to assess the applicant's overall responsibility to administer Federal funds.

“(2) REVIEW.—As part of the review described in paragraph (1), the Secretary may consider any information, including the organization's history with regard to the management of other grants.

“(3) FAILURE TO SATISFY TEST.—The failure to satisfy any 1 responsibility test that is listed in paragraph (4), excluding those listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B), does not establish that the organization is not responsible unless such failure is substantial or persists for 2 or more consecutive years.

“(4) TEST.—The responsibility tests include review of the following factors:

“(A) Unsuccessful efforts by the organization to recover debts, after 3 demand letters have been sent, that are established by final agency action, or a failure to comply with an approved repayment plan.

“(B) Established fraud or criminal activity of a significant nature within the organization.

“(C) Serious administrative deficiencies identified by the Secretary, such as failure to maintain a financial management system as required by Federal rules or regulations.

“(D) Willful obstruction of the audit process.

“(E) Failure to provide services to applicants as agreed to in a current or recent grant or to meet applicable performance measures.

“(F) Failure to correct deficiencies brought to the grantee's attention in writing as a result of monitoring activities, reviews, assessments, or other activities.

“(G) Failure to return a grant closeout package or outstanding advances within 90 days of the grant expiration date or receipt of closeout package, whichever is later, unless an extension has been requested and granted.

“(H) Failure to submit required reports.

“(I) Failure to properly report and dispose of Government property as instructed by the Secretary.

“(J) Failure to have maintained effective cash management or cost controls resulting in excess cash on hand.

“(K) Failure to ensure that a subrecipient complies with its Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133 audit requirements specified at section 667.200(b) of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(L) Failure to audit a subrecipient within the required period.

“(M) Final disallowed costs in excess of 5 percent of the grant or contract award if, in the judgment of the grant officer, the disallowances are egregious findings.

“(N) Failure to establish a mechanism to resolve a subrecipient's audit in a timely fashion.

“(5) DETERMINATION.—Applicants that are determined to be not responsible shall not be selected as grantees.

“(6) DISALLOWED COSTS.—Interest on disallowed costs shall accrue in accordance with the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996.

“SEC. 515. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title such sums as may be nec-

essary for fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

“(b) Amounts appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available for obligation during the annual period that begins on July 1 of the calendar year immediately following the beginning of such fiscal year and that ends on June 30 of the following calendar year. The Secretary may extend the period during which such amounts may be obligated or expended in the case of a particular organization or agency that receives funds under this title if the Secretary determines that such extension is necessary to ensure the effective use of such funds by such organization or agency.

“(c) At the end of the program year, the Secretary may recapture any unexpended funds for the program year, and reobligate such funds within the 2 succeeding program years for—

“(1) technical assistance; or

“(2) grants or contracts for any other program under this title.

“SEC. 516. DEFINITIONS.

“For purposes of this title:

“(1) COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT-BASED TRAINING.—The term ‘community service employment-based training’ means work experience that is related to providing social, health, welfare, and educational services (including literacy tutoring), legal and other counseling services and assistance, including tax counseling and assistance and financial counseling, and library, recreational, and other similar services; conservation, maintenance, or restoration of natural resources; community betterment or beautification; antipollution and environmental quality efforts; weatherization activities; economic development; and such other services essential and necessary to the community as the Secretary determines by rule.

“(2) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘eligible individual’ means an individual who is 55 years of age or older and who has a low income (including any such individual whose income is not more than 125 percent of the poverty line), excluding any income that is unemployment compensation, benefits received under title XVI of the Social Security Act, veterans payments, or 25 percent of the benefits received under title II of the Social Security Act, but—

“(A) pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, any such individual who meets one or more of the following criteria shall have priority for the work opportunities provided under this title—

“(i) is 65 years of age or older; or

“(ii) has one or more of the following barriers to employment:

“(I) has a disability;

“(II) has limited English proficiency or low literacy skills;

“(III) resides in a rural area;

“(IV) is a veteran;

“(V) has low employment prospects; or

“(VI) has failed to find employment after utilizing services provided under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998; and

“(B) notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, excludes—

“(i) an individual who has participated in projects under this title for a period of 48 months in the aggregate (whether or not consecutive) after the date of the enactment of the Senior Independence Act of 2006; and

“(ii) an individual who has participated in projects under this title for a period of 24 months in the aggregate (whether or not consecutive) after the date of the enactment of the Senior Independence Act of 2006 if such individual participated more than 24 months in the aggregate (whether or not consecutive) under title V of this Act, as in effect before the date of the enactment of the Senior Independence Act of 2006.

“(3) INCOME.—The term ‘income’ means income received during the 12-month period (or, at the option of the grantee involved, the 6-month

period that is not multiplied) ending on the date an eligible individual submits an application to participate in the project carried out under this title by such grantee.

“(4) **PACIFIC ISLAND AND ASIAN AMERICANS.**—The term ‘Pacific Island and Asian Americans’ means Americans having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands.

“(5) **PROGRAM.**—The term ‘program’ means the older American community service employment-based training program established under this title.

“(6) **SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.**—The term ‘supportive services’ means services such as transportation, child care, dependent care, housing, and needs-related payments, that are necessary to enable an individual to participate in activities authorized under this title, consistent with the provisions of this title.

“(7) **UNEMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL.**—The term ‘unemployed individual’ means an individual who is without a job and who wants and is available for work, including an individual who may have occasional employment that does not result in a constant source of income.”

SEC. 40. NATIVE AMERICANS CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM.

Section 643 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3057n) is amended by striking “title—” and all that follows through the period at the end, and inserting “title such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.”

SEC. 41. VULNERABLE ELDER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACTIVITIES.

Section 702 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3058a) is amended by striking “2001” each place it appears and inserting “2007”.

SEC. 42. NATIVE AMERICAN ORGANIZATION PROVISIONS.

Section 751(d) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3058aa(b)) is amended by striking “2001” and inserting “2007”.

SEC. 43. ELDER ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND EXPLOITATION PREVENTION.

Section 721 (b) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3058i(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) providing for public education and outreach to promote financial literacy and prevent identity theft and financial exploitation of older individuals;” and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (8) as paragraphs (3) through (9), respectively.

SEC. 44. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 202(e)(1)(A) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period, and

(2) by inserting before section 401 the following:

“TITLE IV—ACTIVITIES FOR HEALTH, INDEPENDENCE AND LONGEVITY”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous information on H.R. 5293.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act of 2006, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this critical measure.

Today supporting the needs of older Americans is more important than ever. More than 49 million people in the United States are over the age of 60, making it the fastest-growing age group in the country. By the year 2050, that number will reach nearly 90 million and comprise almost a quarter of our population. This trend requires substantial reforms to ensure the quality and effectiveness of Federal programs aimed at assisting the elderly.

Last month the Education and the Workforce Committee approved the bipartisan bill before us, legislation that will make those additional reforms by reauthorizing and strengthening the Older Americans Act.

Initially established in 1965, the Older Americans Act has transformed into the first stop for seniors to identify home- and community-based long-term care options, as well as other supportive services that can help prevent or delay expensive institutional care and generate significant savings in Federal entitlement programs. And H.R. 5293 builds on that progress.

Specifically, the bipartisan Senior Independence Act will, number one, promote measures such as nutrition programs and health screens that reduce seniors' risk of injury, disease or disability; two, improve access to health care by supporting resource centers in every community where older Americans and their families can go for reliable information about long-term care options, community support services and important health benefits such as Medicare, prescription drug coverage; and number three, encourage States and communities to plan for an increasing number of older Americans.

□ 1115

This bill also reauthorizes the Senior Community Service Employment Program to provide older individuals with temporary employment-based training opportunities. These opportunities can help seniors obtain the skills they need to obtain a full- or part-time unsubsidized job. This program is a means to an end and should not be considered permanent employment. Therefore, this legislation requires national grantees selected through a full and open competition and States to place 30 percent of their participants into unsubsidized employment by the year 2011.

The bill also encourages grantees to establish partnerships with private sector businesses that can provide participants on-the-job training and help individuals achieve their goal of obtaining employment. At the same time, H.R. 5293 does not lose sight of the valuable community services of this program and requires at least half of all subsidized employment-based training to provide a community service.

My colleagues may recall that in the past, reauthorizing the Older Americans Act was often a very partisan process. However, this year that has not been the case. Both Democrats and Republicans on the Education and the Workforce Committee pulled together to make the reforms necessary to meet the challenges of an aging population. In fact, the bill passed our committee without any opposition whatsoever. I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. TIBERI from Ohio; and his ranking member, Mr. HINOJOSA from Texas; and Mr. GEORGE MILLER, the ranking member of the full committee for their great work and leadership in helping to craft this bill in such a thoughtful, bipartisan manner. During this political season that is quite a rare feat.

I close by thanking all Americans who work or volunteer to support our country's aging network. This strong and vital network is made possible because of a cadre of selfless volunteers who deliver meals to homebound seniors, offer companionship, assist with activities of daily living, and provide many other necessary supports that help older Americans remain healthy and fulfilled. This legislation is designed to support you, and I hope it is a positive reflection of your good work.

Mr. Speaker, Senior Independence Act aims to make the most of the Federal investment in programs to assist older Americans. It is a good bill worthy of our support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act. I would like to thank Chairman McKEON, Subcommittee Chairman TIBERI, Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER, and all of the members of the Education and the Workforce Committee who have rolled up their sleeves to produce a bipartisan bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act.

I would also like to take a moment to commend the outstanding staff on both sides of the aisle for their excellent work. The chairman set up an open process, a process that aimed to engage all of the stakeholders. That kind of process is only successful when you have staff members who are dedicated to getting the job done and able to synthesize the recommendations and build the consensus necessary to move forward. I would especially like to recognize the work of Kate Houston and Lucy House and Angela Klemack on the majority staff, as well as Cheryl Johnson, Ricardo Martinez, and Moira Lenehan on our side of the aisle. They made a sometimes difficult and complicated process go smoothly, and I thank them and appreciate their good and effective service.

Aging is a fact of life. However, through the establishment of Social Security, Medicare, and the enactment of the Older Americans Act, living in

poverty to most Americans no longer is a fact of aging. From 1959 to 2002, the percentage of older people living in poverty fell from 35 percent to only 10 percent.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 is the landmark legislation that articulated our core values as a Nation. The act begins with a declaration of objectives which includes the following: "Retirement in health, honor, dignity, after years of contribution to the economy." This is a statement of our national obligation to older Americans. The Older Americans Act represents our commitment to meeting that obligation. This law provides for supportive services such as transportation, housekeeping, and personal care. It provides nutrition services both in the home and in community settings. It provides preventative health services and supports family caregivers. Finally, it protects the rights of vulnerable older Americans by combating consumer fraud and protecting seniors from abuse.

The legislation before us today, H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act, truly represents our good faith effort to respond to the community's will, as expressed at the White House Conference on Aging where the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act was declared the top priority.

The bill before us reauthorizes all of the core programs in the Older Americans Act. It promotes greater access to services for individuals who are more comfortable in a language other than English. It maintains the structure of the Senior Community Service Employment Program that reaffirms the dual purpose of the programs, employment and community service. It strengthens the very successful Family Caregiver Program. It promotes greater choices and health nutrition education so that our seniors can remain at home and in their communities. It promotes financial literacy for family caregivers and seniors so that older Americans' physical and mental health are not jeopardized by poor financial health. It strengthens our system of protecting older Americans from abuse. Finally, it recognizes that seniors are a growing resource for the aging network and for our communities in general. We must continue to look for ways to leverage our older citizens' talents and desires to continue to make a difference.

It is incumbent upon us all to step up and invest in these programs. It is one sure way to help control the cost of our growing entitlement programs. It is the right thing to do. We know that every dollar spent providing a meal or supporting seniors so that they can remain at home and in their communities not only improves their quality of life but saves entitlement spending on long-term care. That is the genius of the Older Americans Act. Yet we know that the Older Americans Act's purchasing power per individual has dropped by 50 percent since 1980.

As we have worked in a bipartisan manner to craft a reauthorization bill, I was pleased that we were able to advocate together for an increase in the nutrition and support services programs in the Older Americans Act in the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill. I hope that as we move forward with the appropriations process, we will restore the funding that was cut for the Senior Community Service Employment Program and that we will continue to look for ways to increase our investment in all of the critical programs under this Older Americans Act.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman and all of the members of the committee to move this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield at this time 1½ minutes to Mr. KELLER, the chairman of the 21st Century Subcommittee.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act of 2006. This bipartisan legislation would renew the Older Americans Act, which is our Nation's primary Federal program overseeing the delivery of services to our Nation's elderly.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness, I am particularly supportive of the assistance the act provides to our seniors seeking employment. This act includes the Senior Community Service Employment Program, a community-oriented employment-based training program for low-income older Americans. It provides work experience and training opportunities to older individuals to help them prepare for unsubsidized employment. Program participants receive experience through job placements in a wide variety of occupations and industries.

In a nutshell, this legislation helps seniors to help themselves by providing them with valuable job training and placement assistance to get jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 5293.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to an outstanding individual from the great State of Illinois, the ranking member of the Government Reform Subcommittee and a distinguished member of the Select Education Committee, Congressman DANNY DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that you can measure the greatness of a society by how well it treats its young, how well it treats its old, and how well it treats those who have difficulty caring for themselves. So I rise in strong support of this bill, which reauthorizes the Older Americans Act.

At the outset, I want to commend and thank Chairman MCKEON; Ranking Member MILLER; Subcommittee Chairman TIBERI; and the subcommittee ranking member and my colleague from Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, for an excellent bipartisan bill. I also want to extend my sincerest appreciation to the staff persons on both the majority and on the minority sides.

Mr. Speaker, I have a Seniors and Eldercare Task Force composed of a wonderful group of experts who advise me on key issues regarding seniors in my district back in the great city of Chicago. This act advances many areas of concern to my district. Foremost, it expands access of younger grandparents to the National Family Caregiver Support Program, and it encourages States to adopt Kinship Navigator programs for relative caregivers. My district has over 10,000 grandparent-headed households. So the bill aids these caregivers with services that help in their caregiving responsibilities. Further, the bill promotes community-based services via self-directed models of care. This bill will reduce instances of abuse and neglect and improve data collection on the subject, building on the ideas promoted by my colleague from Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL.

I am also happy that the bill emphasizes the importance of mental health in many ways, drawing on the spirit of the Positive Aging Act, sponsored by Mr. KENNEDY. And I want to commend Mr. EHLERS for his efforts to make sure that the mental health component of this legislation is strong.

Mr. Speaker, Hubert Humphrey once said that the moral test of government is how it treats those in the dawn of life, the children, and those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly. The Senior Independence Act of 2006 ensures that our senior citizens would have a greater opportunity for a happy, meaningful, and productive life. I commend the Education and the Workforce Committee for a tremendous piece of legislation.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), the subcommittee chairman who has provided the leadership to get this bill to the floor.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I always tell constituents back home when they ask me what the most important part of my job is, I tell them it is about helping people. This legislation today is really all about helping people, especially our senior citizens.

This bill renews our commitment to the vital programs our older Americans use every day in our communities, in our neighborhoods, and especially in their homes. The Committee on Education and the Workforce voted unanimously to favorably report out the Senior Independence Act of 2006 to the floor today. It is the product of months of hard work to reauthorize and make meaningful amendments to the Older Americans Act. We have heard from

national, from State, from local stakeholders and advocates, those involved directly in the output of services under this act.

□ 1130

We heard from constituents, seniors themselves, those on the receiving end of services, as the subcommittee went into the field and held field hearings in Edinburg, Texas, in Congressman RUBÉN HINOJOSA's district, and in Westerville, Ohio, in my district.

The vast aging network contributed greatly to the reauthorization process. My gratitude goes out to all of them for their commitment to our seniors and to the mission of the act itself. It has been an open and a bipartisan process from the very beginning, and I believe we have a better product and a better bill because of that process, a bill that all Members of this House can support, and a bill that older Americans can support as well.

I want to acknowledge the valuable contribution of the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. HINOJOSA from Texas, and his staff, particularly Ricardo Martinez and Moira Lenehan, for their outstanding contribution to this process. Thank you so much. Mr. HINOJOSA has been a devoted partner from the beginning of this process, and I am so grateful for his work on this legislation.

I also want to acknowledge the leadership, the friendship through the entire process that my friend Chairman McKEON has provided as well. Thank you for your tireless work and the tireless work of your staff. Kate Houston, Stephanie Milburn, Lucy House and Angela Klemack have all been great champions in this work that we have before us today.

I sincerely appreciate the support from the cosponsors of the legislation and all the members of the committee who supported the bill. It is a testament to our sincere efforts to have open and bipartisan process.

The Senior Independence Act builds on the successes of the programs authorized by the Older Americans Act by strengthening services to help individuals avoid institutional care and to improve the quality of life for aging Americans. It promotes the development and implementation of comprehensive, coordinated systems at the Federal, State and local levels to streamline access to programs, benefits and help for individuals to avoid institutional care.

It encourages local area agencies on aging to work with city and county officials, State agencies and other community entities to plan for the aging across multiple areas, including land use, housing, transportation, public safety and recreation.

Among other things, Mr. Speaker, it advances the mission of evidence-based programs to assist older Americans and their family caregivers in learning about and making behavioral changes intended to reduce the risk of injury, disease and disability among seniors.

The bill brings health care monitoring into the 21st century, providing grants specifically for the development of new practices and technologies, allowing physicians and other health care professionals to remotely monitor the health and well-being of our seniors either in the home or in community-based settings. It encourages providers to deliver services in a manner responsive to the needs and preferences of older individuals and their family caregivers.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also expands eligibility for the National Family Caregiver Support Program to grandparents and other relatives age 55 years and older who care for a grandchild or an adult child with a disability.

And this bill gives attention to the rising significance of Alzheimer's disease in our society. Current law allows caregivers to receive support only when they are caring for adults over the age of 60. However, it is estimated that about 300,000, about 7 to 8 percent, of the 4 million Americans diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease are cases, are early onset.

This bill allows caregivers who care for individuals at any age with Alzheimer's disease or other dementia or neurological disorders to receive support from the caregiver support program.

The Senior Independence Act also emphasizes the critical link between nutrition and prevention of chronic disease, and supports efforts to reduce the incidence of obesity, which is a growing problem among all segments of our society, and seniors as well.

It strengthens, finally, Mr. Speaker, the Community Service Employment-Based Training Program for older Americans, promoting business sector partnerships, flexibility to grantees, and recognizing seniors as valuable assets to our communities and to our Nation, promoting activities to harness their services for the greater good of our community and our country.

The Education and Workforce Committee has strived to make the necessary reforms to make the most of the Federal investment in programs to assist older Americans, while ensuring that the growing senior population is served by quality programs established by the 1965 law.

I thank Chairman McKEON, I thank Ranking Member MILLER and Ranking Member HINOJOSA of my subcommittee for their tireless and great work for this product. The Senior Independence Act of 2006 accomplishes all these goals, and I am a proud sponsor of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and urge all my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), and ask unanimous consent that he be able to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the presence of and the comments made by Chairman TIBERI from the State of Ohio, and I want to associate myself with many of the comments that he made about the bipartisanship that was seen and experienced as we worked on this legislation. I congratulate him for his leadership and congratulate him for helping us get to this point that we are today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), a friend and colleague who serves on the powerful Appropriations Committee and is recognized for his commitment and passion for education and health care.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for his great leadership on this bill, and applaud Chairman McKEON for his leadership as well, and also Representative MILLER from California. But I want to begin by paying special tribute to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his leadership on the issues of mental health in the committee and working to try to get more mental health provisions incorporated into this legislation.

I also want to add a special word about my Fellow in my office, Berre Burch. Our Fellows do enormous work for all of us. They don't get paid for it, but they are very committed and spend long hours. Berre Burch has been instrumental in working on many of these provisions on mental health in this bill, as well as many others.

Mr. Speaker, I know we are in a tight budget year, and often programs are not included in bills such as this because of the expense that they have. But, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the mental health needs of our seniors are included in this bill, principally because they do help save us money. Not only do they help save us money in long-term care costs, but they also help save lives as well. Yes, lives.

According to the National Institutes of Health, senior citizens commit suicide at a higher rate than any other age group in our country. Now, understand this. Suicide is already twice the rate of homicide in this country. People don't recognize that. For every murder in this country, two people take their lives.

Now you can see that having senior citizens have the highest suicide rate of all is pretty startling. It runs in the face of our notion of what the golden years of a senior citizen's life should be all about.

We all have been guilty about understanding what it means to be a senior citizen. A lot of us confuse dementia. We say that is part of being old. It doesn't have to be part of what being old is all about. We have proven, effective treatments to intervene with seniors and make sure that the depression

that they may be suffering is something that is treated so that their golden years can actually be golden years, where they can live productive, happy lives.

But what does this country do to our seniors? They put them away. They put them in senior high-rises. They take them away from their families. They don't support them in their communities. They are detached from the social networks in their communities and from the community bonds that keep them uplifted.

Many of them lose their spouse. Many of them lose their independence. They have physical challenges. And all of this leads, very obviously, to anything that we would all acknowledge is depression. Who wouldn't be depressed under these circumstances?

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they don't have to remain depressed. They can get treatment. We can intervene and help them out of these very same challenges.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that has been looked at over and over and over again. Surgeon General Satcher acknowledges it, the New Freedom Commission on Mental Health by President Bush acknowledges it, the White House Commission on Aging, all of whom say that there are many impediments and obstacles to senior citizens getting the mental health care that they need, none the least of which is stigma and stereotype.

In my generation, mental health is no longer the stigma that it used to be. But for many senior citizens, when they hear mental health, they think that it is something wrong with them. They think it is something morally wrong with them.

We need to tell senior citizens this is part of your health care. The brain is part of your body. When the brain has chemical imbalances, we need to treat those.

But, Mr. Speaker, in our country today, even in this great time of prosperity and advancement in science, we still don't acknowledge the brain as part of the body. When it comes to insurance coverage, we don't have parity for mental health or for Medicare parity, which basically means if you have depression or any other mental illness, you are paying a higher copay for your insurance for mental health treatment, you are paying a higher deductible for your health insurance, you are paying a higher premium, because somehow mental health care is treated as if it is cosmetic surgery. It is treated like it is elective surgery. It is not treated as if it is the real physical health challenge that so many millions of Americans face and, tragically, so many senior citizens face on a daily basis.

But it doesn't have to be this way. I appreciate the fact that many portions of my bill called the Positive Aging Act were included in this legislation. But I will continue to fight for mental health parity so that we can give all Americans access to mental health

services, and I will continue to fight for the Positive Aging Act so we get all of the necessary community support systems in place to help treat our seniors with the dignity and the respect that our senior citizens have earned and that we ought to give them.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), a member of our subcommittee who was a great asset to the development of this legislation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act of 2006.

This important piece of legislation includes two amendments I authored along with my friend and colleague from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) regarding elderly abuse prevention and "cash and counseling."

Findings from the National Elder Abuse Incidence Study, which was conducted by the National Center for Elder Abuse, suggests that more than 500,000 Americans age 60 and over were victims of domestic abuse in 1996. As shocking and profound as these numbers are, it is possible that they are on the low end as the problem remains greatly hidden, and cases go unreported.

A few of these cases of neglect and abuse have surfaced in the papers. For example, an 82-year-old East St. Louis man with diabetes who spent 2 weeks at a nursing home had to have his left leg amputated because he did not receive proper care.

In another sickening incident, Chicago paramedics found a 94-year-old man lying in bed unattended for so long that the bones had poked through his skin in several places. His daughter, who was supposedly caring for him in her home, was later charged with two counts of criminal abuse.

Educating seniors, professionals, caregivers and the public on abuse is critical to prevention, and this is obviously a position that warrants the attention of this Congress.

My amendment authorizes the Assistant Secretary on Aging at the Department of Health and Human Services to develop objectives, priorities, policy and a long-term plan for carrying out and coordinating elder justice activities.

In addition, this amendment will help States and local entities coordinate their fragmented activities, and I believe it will ultimately improve elder justice efforts across our great country.

I would like to thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for taking the lead on the cash and counseling amendment. This amendment will support consumer-driven models of home- and community-based care and help prevent high-risk individuals from spending down their savings to receive Medicaid. It does not create a new program. Instead, it revises language in current law that directs the Administration on Aging to develop policy alternatives for long-term care.

Activities such as cash and counseling programs have the potential to generate significant savings to large taxpayer-funded entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid. So I think this amendment makes fiscal sense, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Once again, I would like to thank Mr. DAVIS from Illinois for his help on these important amendments, and also thank Representative TIBERI for his work on the underlying legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5293.

□ 1145

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to give 3 minutes to a hardworking and a valued member of the Education and Workforce Committee and also a member of the Government Reform Committee, Congressman KUCINICH from Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas who serves ably on the Committee. And it is a good demonstration here of bipartisan support, and I certainly want to add to it by supporting the legislation.

I also think that I can speak for many Members in saying how much we appreciate Representative KENNEDY's role in all of this. He has shown himself to be a very valuable Member of this Congress, and his voice is an important voice in this Congress, and we certainly want to do all we can to not only further his leadership, but encourage his participation.

I want to say, though, to Mr. TIBERI, who has done a very good job on this, there is a gaping hole in this legislation, and we need to address it in conference. I intended to offer an amendment that would help provide for administrations on aging and thousands of volunteers nationwide from being squeezed by the rising cost of gasoline. My amendment would have provided a nonbinding formula for calculating annual increases in fuel cost for the three Older American Act programs that are most heavily dependent on transportation. These programs include the in-home nutrition services, the congregate nutrition services, and the supportive services that provide rides to doctors' appointments, trips to the grocery store and to senior centers, among other services.

These programs help seniors maintain their independence, dignity and health. In 2003, the supportive services gave almost 36 million rides and provided 20 million hours of personal care, homemaker and chore services. In that same year, 248 million meals were served. Each meal required transportation.

According to the Energy Information Administration, the price of gas the week ending on Christmas of the year 2000 was \$1.60. The price of gas for the week of May 15, 2006, was \$3.15. In other words, since the Older Americans Act was last authorized, gas prices have doubled.

High gas prices heavily impact programs like meal and transportation services. First, programs have to cut back services for all nonessential trips such as family visits, general shopping, trips to the workplace, and other social activities. Second, volunteer drivers, many of whom are retired and on fixed incomes, are quitting because their mileage reimbursement rates can't be updated by the underfunded Administration on Aging. Finally, as gas prices squeeze seniors living at the financial margin, forcing them to lose their independence, they rely more heavily on services like those provided by the Administration on Aging through the Older Americans Act.

At the same time that prices have gone up, funding has gone down. My amendment would have held harmless from rising gasoline prices the congregate and in-home nutrition services as well as the supportive services by authorizing a yearly adjustment to the fuel component of their budget. If the price of crude oil rises year after year, then the agency's fuel budgets would rise a proportionate amount. If oil prices fall, fuel budgets would fall as well.

Although I strongly support the underlying bill, I want to say that it is important that the House address this in conference. We have to do more to make sure our mothers, fathers, siblings, and grandparents are not losing the services they need to help them lead an independent, dignified, healthy life because of high gas prices. Keep it in mind, so many services are dependent on transportation. If the price of transportation goes up, we don't want senior citizens hurt from this. I ask Mr. TIBERI to do everything he can in conference to help our senior citizens meet this. I thank my fellow colleagues.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a contributing member of the Education and Workforce Committee, a veteran member of the committee from Michigan, Mr. EHLERS.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Senior Independence Act. I commend Congressman TIBERI and Chairman McKEON for their work on this bill. I especially thank Chairman McKEON, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, and their staff members Kate Houston and Jill Hunter-Williams for their work on adding mental health provisions to the bill.

Last winter I had the pleasure of meeting with Suzanne Ogland-Hand, the director of the Center For Senior Care at Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services, a very large faith-based psychiatric hospital located in my district. Ms. Ogland-Hand had served as my delegate to the White House Conference on Aging, and provided valuable input to both the conference and to me regarding the need for a focus on seniors' mental health at the Administration on Aging.

Throughout my life and career, I have met many people, including sen-

iors, who are affected by mental health problems. Certainly the stigma related to mental health issues for seniors is significant. I know this personally because my mother suffered from mental health problems and was very ashamed of it.

I have observed the devastating impact untreated mental health conditions have on individuals and their family members' lives. This bill makes positive steps towards encouraging awareness and coordination of mental health service for seniors. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and vote in favor of it.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to make some closing remarks and acknowledge that during this opportunity that I have had in a year and a half to work with Chairman TIBERI, I have learned to appreciate his commitment to helping people, as he said in his opening remarks, and this bill, H.R. 5293, which will amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 through 2011, and for other purposes, is one that makes me feel very proud to be a part of this work that has been accomplished. I am a proud sponsor of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska, another contributing member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, Mr. OSBORNE.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, as an older American, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act, which reauthorizes the Older American Act. And I want to congratulate Chairman TIBERI, who is not an older American, but he is getting there, as well as Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member MILLER and Mr. HINOJOSA.

The Senior Independence Act, as has been pointed out many times, reauthorizes and strengthens the delivery of social services for older Americans. In my State, Nebraska, 13.6 percent of our population are over 65. In most States, the average is between 10 and 15 percent, and this is a very rapidly increasing percentage. So this is an important segment of our population, and I would like to focus in my brief time here on the significance and the possibilities that lie before seniors.

President Bush stated this. He said, "Too often society views retirement as an ending not just of a career, but of an active life. For many, even most, the opposite is true. Today's elderly are the healthiest, most energetic, best-educated generation of seniors in history. They have more free time, and they want to use it. They have the wisdom of years, and they want to share it."

So seniors are a vast untapped resource in our society, and so we think that we need to better harness those

abilities and those talents that they have.

During committee consideration of this legislation, I along with Mr. FORTUÑO offered an amendment to authorize a pilot project within the Administration on Aging called the Silver Scholarship Initiative to encourage and reward older Americans who dedicate at least 600 hours of service each year to their communities by providing them a \$1,000 educational award. This award can be used for themselves or, probably more likely, for grandchildren, members of their family, or just a young person that they want to designate. This would allow us to harness those volunteer hours and make this more a useful period of their lives.

So while this provision was not added to the bill, I strongly believe in this idea, and I hope that Congress will keep looking for ways to encourage all Americans, especially seniors, to contribute to their communities in the form of this service.

Thank you, and I want to encourage passage of this bill.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for his hard work in building a coalition to put this bill together, and particularly I rise in strong support of the provisions reauthorizing the vital senior nutrition programs. This legislation, like the Stop Senior Hunger Act that I introduced last year, recognizes how important these programs are and how much they help the elderly, the homebound, the disabled, and the frail across America. The senior nutrition programs and these services play a vital role in helping older Americans lead active, independent, healthy lives and avoid unnecessary institutionalization.

The Older Americans Act nutrition programs serve about 250 million congregate and in-home meals to about 6.6 million older adults annually. I have been on some of the deliveries with the volunteers to the Meals on Wheels program. I have had an opportunity to look into the faces of the seniors who are receiving these programs. Very often it is the only contact of the day. It is an extremely cost-effective program, but, more importantly, it is a program that genuinely helps seniors. These meals support quality of life, promote independence, reduce health care costs, decrease nursing home admissions, and help those with long-term illnesses and those who may just need a little short-term assistance after the hospital stay during the time of need. In the words of the Meals on Wheels Association of America, the oldest and largest organization representing senior meal programs, these programs are needed so no senior goes hungry.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and a privilege to be the sponsor of this legislation, to work with Chairman McKEON, before him Chairman BOEHNER, the ranking member of

the subcommittee, Mr. HINOJOSA, the field hearings that we had, the wonderful staff, the bipartisan vote out of committee. I urge all my colleagues to vote "aye" on this great piece of legislation for our aging seniors across our country.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Senior Independence Act of 2006.

The Older Americans Act was enacted in 1965 to establish the Administration on Aging to institute and support Federal nutritional and social programs for this Nation's seniors, and since then, millions of this Nation's elderly have benefited from the Act's many programs.

This Act is more important to the country today than ever before. More than 49 million people in the United States are over the age of 60, making it the fastest growing age group in the country. By 2050, that number will reach nearly 90 million and will count as almost a quarter of our population.

With this rapid demographic increase, it is essential that we ensure the establishment of effective Federal efforts to aid America's elderly. There are more seniors who are minorities, more seniors who are trying to go back to work; more seniors who are living longer; and more seniors living in urban areas. Specifically, the Senior Independence Act will promote home- and community-based supports to help older individuals avoid institutional care, strengthen health and nutrition programs, improve educational and volunteer services, increase Federal, State, and local coordination, and safeguard employment-based training for older Americans.

This Act was conceived forty years ago in a spirit of bipartisanship to better the lives of those put in less fortunate circumstances. I would like to commend Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member MILLER today on their spirit of bipartisanship during this reauthorization.

I am especially thankful to the Chairman and his committee staff for working with me to include my amendments that would recognize the growing number of older Americans who are living in urban areas and would encourage life-long learning.

The number of Americans aging in urban areas is growing and its diversity is increasing. Between 1999 and 2030, the urban minority population of 65 and older is projected to increase by 217 percent, as compared with the projected 81 percent increase among the white population. My amendment, which has been included in the bill, will assist urban seniors by providing grants to discover how older Americans can age successfully in urban areas.

The bill also adds my amendment to promote and disseminate information about life-long learning programs. Researchers and clinicians are increasingly interested in the concept of successful aging, and they are finding that a person who engages in a healthy lifestyle including continuing education, thinking and maintaining social contacts are part of successful.

Together, these amendments will improve the lives of older Americans by helping to address the unique needs of those living in urban areas and also to help promote the benefits of taking part in life-long learning programs.

In closing, I would also like to pause and remember the life and work of Dr. Elizabeth

Kutza. Dr. Elizabeth Kutza was the Professor of Community Health and former Director of the Institute on Aging at Portland State University. Dr. Kutza died on Friday, June 9, 2006, after a seven-year battle with breast cancer. Dr. Kutza and her family are in my thoughts and prayers.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member MILLER for their outstanding writing of this bill and for making sure that the Older Americans Act can continue to provide for the growing number of seniors in our country today.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of providing the social and nutritional support that older Americans need, and in support of the Seniors Independence Act of 2006.

Since originally enacted in 1965, the Older Americans Act has been an important vehicle by which senior citizens in need have received nutritional support, community service employment, pension counseling services, protections against neglect and abuse, and many other services.

Nutrition services through Title III of the Older Americans Act, such as the "Meals on Wheels" program, are essential in helping senior citizens who cannot prepare their own food to still have access to convenient and nutritious meals. The program serves those most in need, such as the aged, the less affluent, those who live alone, and members of minority groups.

I was pleased that I was able to amend the Seniors Independence Act during markup to stop the Department of Labor from using an unfair calculation of income to determine eligibility for Title V seniors community service employment programs (SCSEP). In January 2005, the Department of Labor issued a "Training and Employment Guidance Letter" that unilaterally changed the eligibility criteria for Title V. Instead of discounting certain forms of income like veterans' compensation, Social Security Disability Insurance, unemployment compensation, and a portion of traditional Social Security benefits, the new regulation mandated inclusion of that income, thus making fewer seniors eligible for vital services.

It would be inconsistent to state that the program targets persons with greatest economic need and persons who are disabled, and then use their Social Security income or disability benefits to exclude them from participation. It would also be a mistake to hold someone's service in the Armed Forces against them in determining their eligibility for employment assistance. The amendment that I offered in the Education and the Workforce Committee restores the eligibility criteria to the pre-2005 levels, and it was unanimously agreed to. I thank Chairman MCKEON and the rest of the committee for their help and cooperation on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Seniors Independence Act of 2006 reauthorizes vital services for some of the most vulnerable Americans, and those in greatest need. I rise in support of H.R. 5293, and I urge its passage by this body.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5293, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 426) recognizing the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drugs Act for the important service it provides the Nation, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 426

Whereas the Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 768; chapter 3915), transformed the Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") into a scientific regulatory agency;

Whereas the FDA is the oldest consumer protection agency in the United States;

Whereas the FDA is the primary consumer protection agency in the United States and the world;

Whereas FDA has the critical mission of protecting the public health by ensuring that—

(1) foods are safe, wholesome, sanitary, and properly labeled;

(2) human and veterinary drugs are safe and effective;

(3) devices intended for human use are safe and effective;

(4) cosmetics are properly labeled; and

(5) consumers are protected from electronic product radiation;

Whereas FDA is also responsible for advancing the public health by helping to speed innovations which improve peoples' lives;

Whereas, in protecting and promoting the health of citizens of the United States, the FDA has been a pioneer and leader in the field of food and drug science;

Whereas people around the world enjoy a higher quality of life due, in part, to the work of the FDA to expand food safety, medical product safety, and regulatory science; and

Whereas the centennial anniversary of the passage of the 1906 Food and Drugs Act occurs on June 30, 2006, marks the 100th anniversary of the Agency's founding, and is a major milestone in FDA's celebrated history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress recognizes the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services and its employees for—

(1) 100 years of service in working to ensure the safety of our food and the safety and efficacy of our medical products;

(2) providing leadership to the world in the regulatory sciences; and

(3) their hard work and extraordinary dedication to the protection and promotion of our Nation's public health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 426, a resolution offered by the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. JOE BARTON of Texas, and the ranking member of the committee, Mr. JOHN DINGELL of Michigan.

Today the House is honoring the 100th anniversary of the Food and Drug Administration, an organization responsible for ensuring the gold standard of safety for the medical products Americans use and the foods we consume.

□ 1200

For a century now, the dedicated public servants at FDA have worked professionally and tirelessly to promote public health by regulating drugs, biologics, medical devices and cosmetics in a science-based way. As a result of their continued efforts, the United States stands alone, rightfully laying claim to the safest and most effective medical product supply in the world.

Additionally, the agency's vigilant work on food safety protects us against natural and man-made threats to the safety of the foods we eat.

The long-standing tradition of professionalism and diligence of this important agency, which regulates roughly 25 percent of our gross domestic product, continues today under the able leadership of the Acting Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Dr. Andrew C. von Eschenbach. Under his leadership, the FDA enters its second century of service, with both a broad history and a bright future.

As chairman of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee, I look forward to continuing to work closely with Dr. von Eschenbach and his agency's outstanding staff on many important public health issues. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dr. von Eschenbach and the more than 10,000 civil servants for their continued service to the American people who are safer and healthier because of their efforts.

Again, I would like to commend Chairman BARTON and Ranking Member DINGELL for offering this worthy resolution and for their strong leadership on FDA-related issues. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleagues, both Chairman BARTON and Ranking Member DINGELL, for introducing this resolution.

The Food and Drug Administration is the Nation's premier consumer protection agency. It ensures that food and drugs are safe and properly labeled, that medical devices are safe and effective, and that cosmetics are properly labeled. In the 100 years since its founding, the FDA has changed with the times and has adapted to the health and safety needs of Americans.

As initially enacted, the 1906 Food and Drug Act prohibited food, drinks and drugs to be adulterated or misbranded.

Over the years, the scope of the FDA has increased significantly. In 1938, its authority was extended to cosmetics and devices through a law that also established a new system for regulating drugs. The 1938 law also gave the authority to inspect factories.

By the 1960s, the FDA's role in ensuring drug safety expanded even more as the 1962 drug amendments required pharmaceutical manufacturers to prove the effectiveness of their drugs before being allowed to market them.

In 1958, the FDA played a key role in the country's response to the growing AIDS epidemic by approving the first blood test for AIDS.

Given the sensitive nature of its many activities and the effect they have on Americans from all walks of life, the FDA has not been without controversy or its critics. Yet, 100-years after its creation, I hope that we can all agree that the FDA remains a critical part of our efforts to protect and improve the health and safety of our Nation.

Every day, the FDA evaluates and approves new drugs and medical devices that improve our lives and productivity. It regulates food packages so we know what we are getting when we buy food for our families at the grocery store. The agency develops oversight policies regarding blood donations to ensure safe blood supplies. These are just some of the way the FDA's responsibilities are essential to protecting the public health.

As we come up on the 100th anniversary of this vital Agency, I am happy to support this resolution honoring the FDA and its staff for their 100 years of work to protect and improve public health.

Just a side note, Mr. Speaker, the FDA Commissioner von Eschenbach actually was a great researcher at MD Anderson in Houston, and with the National Cancer Institute, now at the FDA. Again, I know of no better person to be at the FDA because of both his experience, both as a cancer patient, but also as a researcher. He knows how important it is to make sure our drugs are protected will actually cure us, and will do what they say they will.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no other additional speakers, and

I will be prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have two speakers, and I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a colleague from the same class of mine.

(Mr. HINCHEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my good friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for providing me with this opportunity.

As we have heard, Mr. Speaker, next week the Food and Drug Administration turns 100 years old, and it is unfortunate that this agency is not making laudatory headlines as it celebrates such an auspicious occasion.

Instead, the Food and Drug Administration is at the nadir of its trustworthiness with the American people. Its basic defense of the public health has simply been perverted in the name of so-called conservative interests.

As a member of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee which has oversight over the Food and Drug Administration, I have been frustrated by the agency's cozy relationship with the pharmaceutical industry whose products it is supposed to regulate.

In 2001, fees paid by the drug companies funded 32 percent of the FDA's budget for drugs. Today, that figure is nearly 50 percent, and it is expected to go higher. Making matters worse, the FDA must negotiate with the drug industry on how those user fees are allocated. This financial dependency, along with the FDA's constant negotiations with companies over how to spend the fees, is the foundation for the conflict of interest that exists between the FDA and the pharmaceutical industry and others it is supposed to regulate.

I have been alarmed that financial conflicts of interest are waived by the FDA among its advisory committee members. The agency relies heavily on these scientists and these experts to guide policy when questions arise concerning medical treatments. When the FDA allows conflicted scientists to serve on these boards, events that have occurred over 100 times already during this fiscal year alone, the public health is obviously jeopardized at the expense of inappropriate personal interests.

I have been saddened by the stories I have heard from American families who have paid the price for mismanagement of this agency. I have met with many of these families on the efforts by the FDA to preempt their right to sue pharmaceutical companies in local and State courts. These families must be allowed to seek the understanding and justice they are owed after their loved ones are injured or killed from an adverse reaction to a product regulated by the FDA. I will meet with some of these families again later next week.

For these and many other reasons, I and many of my Democratic colleagues have introduced legislation, the FDA Improvement Act and others, to address many of the loopholes that currently exist at this agency. This legislation would sever the financial links between the FDA and the drug companies. It would restore the independence of the FDA. It would strengthen the agency's efforts to guarantee post-market drug safety. It would eradicate conflicts of interest on FDA advisory boards. It would restore the public trust in this very critically important agency.

Last month, the Wall Street Journal and Harris Interactive released a poll on public perceptions of the job that the FDA is doing on the safety of prescription drugs. Only 36 percent of the adults polled believe that the agency was doing a good job on ensuring the safety and efficacy on new prescription drugs. Eighty-two percent of the people polled believed that the FDA's decisions are influenced by politics over medical science to a great extent or at least to some extent.

According to its own Web site, the FDA is our country's oldest consumer protection agency. It should be given the authority to do its job independently, and the administration should sufficiently use that authority to protect the American people. It is a two-step process.

Yesterday, the American Association of Retired Persons reported that prices for brand-name pharmaceuticals jumped nearly 4 percent during the first 3 months of this year alone. The men and women paying for these drugs should be able to trust in the safety and the efficacy of the products for which they are paying so dearly.

The Food and Drug Administration's 100th anniversary should be a time of celebration, and if we are going to make it such, we have to bring forward legislation to the floor of this House, legislation which makes the Food and Drug Administration free and independent, legislation which reestablishes the arm's-length relationship between the regulator and the regulated. That arm's-length relationship has completely disappeared because the FDA has become financially dependent upon the agency, the entities, the corporations, the drug companies that it is supposed to regulate, and that regulation has fallen apart.

Let us bring forward legislation to the floor of this House which improves the FDA and protects the American people.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our colleague from Chicago (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in thanking Congressmen BARTON and DINGELL for introducing H. Con. Res. 426, which recognizes the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drug Act. I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I rise in support of this resolution. First of all, Chicago had a great deal to do with the development of the Food and Drug Act because of the book that Upton Sinclair wrote, "The Jungle," and the vast stockyards and meat packing plants that were in Chicago, running amok and running afoul at that time.

But I most directly want to associate my comments with those of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), who just spoke, because I too believe that we must, in fact, have enough distance between the Food and Drug Administration and any kinds of political considerations.

I have had the opportunity in the last few weeks to meet and hear and be in the presence of Dr. Andrew C. von Eschenbach, the new acting director, and I must tell you that I have been tremendously impressed with his vision, with the articulation of a mission for the Food and Drug Administration, and with the assurances that he continues to give that science-based evidence will be his approach.

So I am optimistic about what the Food and Drug Administration is going to continue to do in the future, and we are going to find ourselves pleasantly pleased, I believe, under the leadership of Dr. von Eschenbach.

So I thank the gentleman again from Texas for yielding.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, again, I know I do not have the right to close, but I just encourage passage of this bill and recognize the 100 years, not that it is perfect, but we are still working on it, particularly in our committee, and encourage passage of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here today to say that the Food and Drug Administration is infallible. They certainly have made mistakes, as I am sure every Member of this body has made mistakes.

We are here, though, to say that over the past 100 years, there have been tens of thousands of FDA employees who have dedicated their lives to ensuring that our food and our medical products are safe. Time and again, Congress has entrusted fundamental safety responsibilities to the FDA.

We do not have a perfect system, but because of the dedicated public servants at the FDA, the United States stands alone as having the safest and most effective medical products supply in the world.

In 2002, we entrusted the FDA with new authorities to protect our food supply from terrorist threats. Every day, the employees at the FDA go to work to protect the best interests of the American people.

Although we may have disagreements over particular issues, we are better off as a country by having the dedicated individuals at the FDA working for the American people. We should

not politicize a resolution that seeks to recognize their hard work. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 426, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH CENTERS RENEWAL ACT OF 2006

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5573) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional authorizations of appropriations for the health centers program under section 330 of such Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5573

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Community, migrant, public housing, and homeless health centers are vital to thousands of communities across the United States.

(2) There are more than 1,000 such health centers serving over 15,000,000 people at over 3,700 health delivery sites, located in all 50 States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and other territories of the United States.

(3) Health centers provide cost-effective, quality health care to poor and medically underserved people in the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories, including the working poor, the uninsured, and many high-risk and vulnerable populations, and have done so for over 40 years.

(4) Health centers provide care to 1 of every 8 uninsured Americans, 1 of every 4 Americans in poverty, and 1 of every 9 rural Americans.

(5) Health centers provide primary and preventive care services to more than 700,000 homeless persons and more than 725,000 farm workers in the United States.

(6) Health centers are community-oriented and patient-focused and tailor their services to fit the special needs and priorities of local communities, working together with schools, businesses, churches, community organizations, foundations, and State and local governments.

(7) Health centers are built through community initiative.

(8) Health centers encourage citizen participation and provide jobs for 50,000 community residents.

(9) Congress established the program as a unique public-private partnership, and has continued to provide direct funding to community organizations for the development and operation of health centers systems that

address pressing local health needs and meet national performance standards.

(10) Federal grants assist participating communities in finding partners and recruiting doctors and other health professionals.

(11) Federal grants constitute, on average, 24 percent of the annual budget of such health centers, with the remainder provided by State and local governments, Medicare, Medicaid, private contributions, private insurance, and patient fees.

(12) Health centers make health care responsive and cost-effective through aggressive outreach, patient education, translation, and other enabling support services.

(13) Health centers help reduce health disparities, meet escalating health care needs, and provide a vital safety net in the health care delivery system of the United States.

(14) Health centers increase the use of preventive health services, including immunizations, pap smears, mammograms, and HbA1c tests for diabetes screenings.

(15) Expert studies have demonstrated the impact that these community-owned and patient-controlled primary care delivery systems have achieved both in the reduction of traditional access barriers and the elimination of health disparities among their patients.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR HEALTH CENTERS PROGRAM OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.

Paragraph (1) of section 330(r) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(r)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (d), there are authorized to be appropriated \$1,963,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, \$1,999,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, \$2,015,000,000 for fiscal year 2009, \$2,041,000,000 for fiscal year 2010, and \$2,041,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 1215

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5573, the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006, which is legislation to reauthorize the Community Health Center program for another 5 years. As we learned from the hearings we held last month in the Subcommittee on Health, the Community Health Center program has been an unprecedented success, and community health centers are an integral part of this country's health care delivery system, providing quality health care services to people and communities that would otherwise not have access to such care.

We are sticking with the old maxim of not fixing something that isn't broken, and this legislation represents simply a straight reauthorization of that program and seeks to build upon the success of the program by significantly increasing the levels of authorized funding.

I am proud to sponsor this legislation, along with my friend, Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS of Florida, and I would like to thank the 24 members of the Energy and Commerce Committee who have joined us as cosponsors of this bill.

Again, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us today, which will reauthorize the community health center program through 2011. Over the years, the health center program has gained tremendous support from Democrats and Republicans, the Congress, and the President, a claim that can be made by very few Federal programs.

This support is due to the overwhelming impact that health centers have made on the health and well-being of our country's most vulnerable populations. In 2005, health centers provided care to 6 million uninsured individuals who represented 40 percent of the patient population at health centers. Ninety-one percent of health center patients are low income, and 36 percent are Medicaid.

Without a doubt, health centers are meeting their mission for providing much-needed health care to the medically underserved in this country. Much of this success can be attributed to the core elements of section 330 of the statute we seek to reauthorize today. To be eligible for Federal funding, health centers must be located in medically underserved communities; they must have independent boards, a majority of which must be governed by members of the community who utilize the center for health care; and they must also provide compulsory, primary, and preventive health care with services available to all community residents regardless of the patient's ability to pay.

This focus on primary and preventive care has yielded tremendous savings for our health care system, as health centers provide the uninsured and underinsured with access to care that they would otherwise seek in our hospital emergency rooms.

A study in Harris County, Houston, Texas, where my district lies, found that 57 percent of the emergency room visits could be handled at a primary care clinic. This is a perfect example of the type of health care problem that health centers help solve.

Access to affordable primary care at health centers has also reduced the need for inpatient and specialty care.

Because of medical problems in health centers, patients are treated earlier before they require in-hospital treatment. In fact, a study suggests that health centers saved Medicaid approximately 30 percent in annual spending on beneficiaries receiving care at our Nation's health centers.

This successful result is that health centers have become the medical home for more than 15 million Americans. Health centers also represent the Nation's largest primary care system, with one in nine Medicaid beneficiaries and one in five low-income individuals receiving care at health centers.

I have a personal interest in this issue because we have been working for years in the Houston area to establish additional community health centers to serve our growing uninsured and underinsured population. My State of Texas, unfortunately, ranks number one in the number of uninsured and with 25 percent of Texans living without insurance.

The statistics for the Houston area are just as troubling. More than 30 percent of Harris County residents are living without health insurance. Despite the obvious need for additional health centers in the Houston area, we have been playing catch-up for quite a while. Last year our area was awarded five additional FQHCs, federally qualified health centers, bringing our total to nine sites, including look-alike centers.

With more than 1 million uninsured, however, the Houston area will still have fewer than 10 FQHCs, while other large cities, like Chicago, have more than 70 sites. In the Houston area we know our work is not done. As a Nation we have a long way to go before we meet the President's goal of locating health centers in every low-income county in this country.

In fact, studies suggest there are still more than 900 poor counties in the U.S. in need of a health center. To ensure that these goals are met, it is crucial that we pass this bill to reauthorize the health center program, whose current authorization expires this year.

Mr. DEAL, Mr. BILIRAKIS and I have put together a compromise bill that will reauthorize the program to 2011, keeping intact the core elements of the program that have been critical to its success, and I want to thank all my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee who supported this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), who has been one of the cosponsors of this legislation and a leading supporter of community health centers.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEAL, and I do rise in support of this bill which I have cosponsored with Chairman DEAL and with our colleague from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

I have long championed community health centers, Mr. Speaker, because they have been a model for delivering primary and preventive care efficiently and effectively for more than four decades. They serve more than 16 million Americans, many of whom are underinsured or uninsured, in areas where people need most services. They make their services available to all residents of the communities in which they are located without regard to their ability to pay.

One of the reasons community health centers have successfully provided care to so many through the years is that the individual centers are governed by a community board, a majority of whose members are patients of the health center itself. I think this feature makes health centers more responsive to the needs of the communities they serve than they otherwise might be.

Health centers have proven that health care need not be complicated or expensive to work well. The health centers program started more than 40 years ago with the idea that patients should run the show, a remarkably simple formula for success. This patient democracy, if you will, shapes the delivery of health care to the community and determines the range of affordable services the health center will provide.

And those services are certainly needed. Despite our best efforts, there are still far too many Americans who lack health insurance and for whom community health centers are their only source of care. These vulnerable individuals need the Community Health Centers program to remain strong and vibrant as they work toward greater health security for themselves and their families.

The authorization for this valuable program expires this year; however, I have introduced legislation with our colleague from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) to reauthorize the Federal health center program through 2011. Our bill would authorize \$1.93 billion in funding in fiscal year 2007, thereby increasing funding next year to the level the President has requested, or approximately \$181 million more than last year.

Although we introduced the bill only a few weeks ago, I am pleased that it already has 233 bipartisan cosponsors, more than half the House, including almost every member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. I believe these numbers are a testament to the broad and bipartisan support for reauthorizing the Federal health center program this year while preserving the key elements of its authorizing statute.

The bill we are considering today is identical to the Bilirakis-Green bill, except it includes specific authorization levels for fiscal years 2008 through 2011, which would bring health center funding to \$2.04 billion by fiscal year 2011 and allow for the continued expan-

sion of health centers in needed areas around the country.

I certainly want to thank our full committee chairman, Mr. BARTON, and our subcommittee chairman, Mr. DEAL, for acting expeditiously on reauthorizing this important program.

Although I am pleased the bill before us today maintains the fundamental structure of the Federal health center program, I do support making what I believe are commonsense legislative changes to enhance the ability of community health centers to provide care to those who need it, and, hopefully in the coming weeks, to examining the merits of several of the proposals which my committee colleagues have put forth that I believe would do just that.

I am especially supportive of H.R. 1313, legislation our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) has introduced, which would extend liability protection to volunteer physicians at community health centers. I believe that this change, which the National Association of Community Health Centers fully supports, will encourage doctors and other medical professionals to volunteer their time and talent at health centers in underserved areas which are facing workforce shortages.

I believe that it is imperative we move forward on Mr. MURPHY's legislation as soon as possible. There currently, as we know, is a serious shortage of health care providers in areas where community health centers are located. In addition, there will be an increasing demand for physicians to serve the millions of new patients that will be seeking care as centers come on line as part of President Bush's initiative to put new community health centers in medically underserved areas around the country.

As many of us know, the high cost of medical liability insurance can be prohibitive, especially for physicians who are going above and beyond, so to speak, by volunteering at community health centers. The bill that Mr. MURPHY has introduced, which I have cosponsored, would do that by extending the medical liability protections under the Federal Tort Claims Act to volunteer physicians at community health centers.

I believe this commonsense proposal would encourage more qualified health care providers to volunteer their much-needed services at health centers that desperately need their expertise. Although I would have preferred, Mr. Speaker, to also be considering this legislation here today, I am nonetheless, of course, fully supportive of the bill and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, community health centers have deservedly earned bipartisan support in Congress because of their long and well-documented record of success. This bill will help them continue their mission well into the future, especially in the most needed areas around the country. I urge all our colleagues to both support and invest

in proven health care solutions by voting for H.R. 5573. The health and well-being of our constituents depends on it.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our colleague on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Congressman ENGEL of New York.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me, and I rise in strong support of the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006.

Community health centers ensure that over 15 million low-income Americans, including 1 million New Yorkers, get access to affordable primary care and preventive services regardless of insurance status or ability to pay. In my own district, I am very proud of the good work that the Mount Vernon Neighborhood Health Center, Refuah Health Center, the Community Medical and Dental Care Center in Monsey, and the Bronx Community Health Network do. I am proud of them.

Patients who use community health centers are some of our Nation's most vulnerable, with unique and complex health care needs. It has been estimated that nearly 70 percent of community health center patients have family incomes at or below the Federal poverty level. These patients, therefore, benefit from the special services that community health centers provide, such as transportation and translation assistance, which truly opens access to health care.

Community health centers improve health outcomes through their cost-effective, high-quality care. It is estimated that the health centers save the Federal Medicaid 30 percent in annual spending through innovative care. Both the Institute of Medicine and General Accountability Office have praised health centers for their effective management of chronic illnesses and have said they are a model in screening and diagnosing conditions like asthma, cardiovascular disease, depression, cancer, and HIV/AIDS. In addition, community health centers are estimated to be responsible for cutting infant mortality rates in the communities they serve by as much as 10 percent.

Considering these facts, we should support the community health centers with additional funding. Less than 25 percent of applications for new health center sites were funded last year, despite being qualified. It is also worth noting that when we do consider health information technology on the floor, we must ensure appropriate Federal investment in grants and loans to ensure community health centers get access to the technology.

While the unanimously passed Senate bill included Federal funding for low-income providers, the Energy and Commerce bill, unfortunately, did not. Health IT has the potential to even further improve the quality of care at the community health centers, but the centers simply cannot afford the technology without extra help.

I should note that New York City appropriated \$27 million to help provide

1,000 New York City doctors treating underserved patients with electronic health record systems by 2008. The city's contribution is being matched by an additional \$13 million contributed by the community health centers participating in the program. The end result is that 30 community health centers, which include 150 sites, will be linked throughout New York City. This worthy initiative would certainly benefit from Federal assistance as well.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for calling for the reauthorization of the health centers program. Millions of people will be better for it.

□ 1230

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Community Health Center Reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching 1,000 community health centers with 3,600 sites serving over 13 million Americans. There are over 80 of these sites in northeast Georgia alone, in my district and in Chairman DEAL's district. They operate in rural communities where health services are either scarce, or, in some cases, nonexistent. They help keep our poor out of expensive emergency rooms.

With 25 percent of our population living in rural areas, only 10 percent of our physicians practice there. Rural Americans, like many folks in my district, are more likely to live below the poverty level and therefore be uninsured.

Health centers are Medicaid and Medicare providers, guaranteeing access for much of our elderly. While health care costs have risen, health centers have been kept theirs well under those of other providers.

Patients of health centers are generally healthier, use emergency rooms less and save money. In Georgia, they save the State \$13.4 million each year in Medicaid costs alone. Community health centers are a good deal for poor Americans and taxpayers.

I have been an enthusiastic supporter of this program, and I am glad the President has supported the expansion of health centers in 200 new communities.

Mr. Speaker, the least expensive way possible to provide health care is to provide the best possible treatment up front. Community health centers are doing just that, and all of us need to support them.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), an active member of the committee.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support as well of the Health Centers Renewal Act, and commend all of our colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee, but

especially the subcommittee chairman, Mr. DEAL, and the ranking member, Mr. BROWN, for working together in this bipartisan fashion to pass this legislation.

Community health centers are vital to our Nation's delivery of primary care services to those who otherwise would lack access to health care. In my own district, we are fortunate to have several excellent health centers, including Clinicas del Camino Real in Ventura County, the Santa Barbara and Isla Vista Neighborhood Clinics in Santa Barbara County, and Health Care for the Homeless in San Luis Obispo County.

At a time when this body often seems too willing to divest from primary and preventive care, health centers are a model of success. They ensure that individuals in low income and medically underserved communities can receive checkups, screenings and early interventions, especially in a culturally sensitive environment. This is essential.

It means that conditions can be diagnosed and treated before they unnecessarily progress, at which point they often require very expensive treatment and sometimes hospitalization.

Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise that care at our health centers is the most cost effective care there is. We would do well to look at the lessons learned at our community health centers' focus on primary and preventive care and expand this to all areas of health care delivery in this country.

We know we need to be doing much more to expand access to care to encourage Americans to take advantage of primary care services available to them. Oftentimes, the community health center is the only care available to our constituents, so I support the reauthorization of health centers, and I hope we can use this as a stepping stone to further improve access to primary care for our entire Nation.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), a member of the committee who has been very supportive of community health centers and has some very good ideas for additional improvements.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and chairman, Mr. DEAL. I am pleased to be a co-sponsor of this legislation and to have worked closely with him on this vitally important bill that saves money and lives, and I am pleased to represent Cornerstone Community Center, one of the centers in my district.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5573 is a great step toward meeting our Nation's health care needs. Community health centers are a critically important solution to providing affordable and accessible quality care to millions of Americans who are uninsured or underinsured.

Medical care at community health centers is approximately \$250 less than the average annual expenditure for office-based doctor visits. And keep in mind that over 30 percent of patients

seeking care at a health center are uninsured. That is some 15 million people a year that seek care.

Moreover, health center services save money and lives by treating diseases before they become chronic conditions, require hospital care or require a trip to the emergency room.

I have with me here a list of the typical procedures that are offered at community health centers: Prenatal care, dental care, mental health care, substance abuse counseling, hearing and vision screening. They also offer discount prescription drugs. They provide vital case management for those with chronic illness, and keep in mind that 80 percent of health care costs go to those with chronic illness. Oftentimes, those complex cases require that sort of case management to help them meet the needs of their cases. They provide smoking cessation classes, blood pressure monitoring, weight reduction programs, and a host of other programs so vital to saving money in health care.

It also provides a health care home for many folks, many clinics giving patients a card so they recognize this is a place where they know their doctor and their doctor knows them.

By expanding community health centers, Americans could save as much as 30 percent for Medicaid patients, or \$17 billion annually, due to reduced specialty care referrals and fewer hospital admissions.

However, our Nation's community health centers are experiencing a staffing crisis. A March 2006 publication in the Journal of the American Medical Association reported that community health centers have a 13 percent vacancy rate for family physicians, a 9 percent vacancy rate for interns, 20 percent vacancy for OB-GYNs, and an 8 percent vacancy rate for podiatrists, 22 percent for psychiatrists, and 18 percent for dentists. In other words, although we are trying to meet the needs of the 15 million who use the community health centers, the problem is growing in that not enough doctors are available to provide that care.

Vacancies of needed medical personnel at community health centers jeopardizes access to care to the Nation's uninsured and underinsured. Plus, the President has called for more centers around the Nation to fill our needs, and 11,000 more doctors are needed to fill those needs.

I have a letter from the National Association of Community Health Centers that says there is a dire shortage of health care providers in underserved communities where health centers are located. Congress and the President have worked to double the capacity of the Federal health centers programs, but in order to ensure that millions of additional patients can be served through this initiative, health centers must also double their workforce by adding 12,000 clinicians and 48,000 administrative staff soon.

Many skilled health care providers are willing to volunteer their time and

expertise. Volunteer doctors acting as Good Samaritans have proved invaluable to clinics across the Nation. However, many skilled medical volunteers are turned away because community health centers cannot afford to cover their additional medical liability insurance.

Over the past year, I have been pleased to work with Chairman DEAL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and also Chairman BARTON to make volunteering at community health centers more practical to doctors in order to meet the needs of families. Community health centers play a key role in any reform-minded approach to improving our health care delivery system.

Mr. Speaker, there is a desperate need for doctors and medical personnel of all sorts at community health centers, and I pledge I will continue to work with Chairman BARTON and Chairman DEAL and other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee and every Member of this body to explore every solution possible to meet our Nation's community health center staffing crisis.

We owe this to the patients, to the taxpayers of America who recognize this is a cost-saving, viable measure where we can provide care to millions of Americans who otherwise do not have it. This is the way we should be doing this, through community health centers, centers where the doctors know the patients and the patients know the doctors.

Please let us continue to work together to make this care affordable and accessible for patients all around the Nation so they do not have to see dire consequences that come when their conditions get worse because they couldn't receive the care they needed.

I thank the chairman for yielding me this time and for our collaboration together.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), our colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5573, the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006.

H.R. 5573 reauthorizes the Community Health Center program, guaranteeing a funding source for critical providers in communities like mine.

Community health centers leverage what little they have to ensure working families, the uninsured, and our Nation's children have access to critical medical care.

More than 40 million people in our country lack health care coverage today, including one in three in the San Gabriel Valley and in East Los Angeles. Eighty-three percent of the uninsured are from working families, and 14 million of those families are Latinos.

Community health centers are a fundamental component to our safety net, often providing vital care in a culturally competent and linguistically appropriate manner for all families, and often being the only source of care.

In my own district, community health centers bear the brunt of responsibility for treating the uninsured. After 70 years of serving much of my congressional district in the city of Azusa, our health center there was forced to be closed. There was not sufficient funding to keep it open. I knew one in three people in my district without health insurance would suffer without access to this care.

Through the support of the city of Azusa, Los Angeles County and many other community organizations, the clinic in Azusa was opened. Now it is there because we were able to secure section 330 designation. Now they can open their doors and serve the thousand or so patients that come through their doors every month. It is exciting to tour that clinic and see the kind of assistance that mothers are receiving in terms of prenatal care, to see that the elderly are having someone help them manage their diabetes, and to see that young children are getting their immunizations. Those things are vitally important to our community.

There is another community clinic that has been in my district for over 30 years, and what is wonderful about this particular clinic is that it also serves surrounding congressional districts. Mr. DREIER's constituents receive services from the East Valley Clinic, as do Mrs. NAPOLITANO's constituents. We worked there to help leverage support and fund services to serve all of our residents and constituents.

I am proud to say this is a wonderful bill to be able to express our strong support, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY).

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the chairman for his fine work on bringing forward this bill, as well as the ranking member, and for the bipartisan nature of this bill.

As so many other speakers have testified this morning, community health centers are an integral part of our health care network throughout our country, and are an increasingly important aspect of trying to deal with the uninsured and underinsured.

The reason they are so important is that community health centers focus on preventive care and primary care. They offer low-cost alternatives to emergency room visits, which is not only the most expensive care that people can get, but also why should we be letting illnesses progress to that stage when community health centers can help people with preventive and primary care.

Community health centers focus on the uninsured and the underinsured, a critical element of our health care delivery system. And the cost savings to our system are significant, as other people have testified this morning.

In my State of New Hampshire, in 2004 there were 219,000 patient visits to

community health centers. Not only do they provide basic preventive care, but also education, outreach, screenings, nutrition counseling, substance abuse counseling, prenatal care, and dental care, so the community health centers are full service medical care for so many different people in our community.

I have eight community health centers in my district. I have visited three of them, and I would like to cite them all for their good work: The Avis Goodwin Community Health Center in Dover that is run by Janet Atkins; the Manchester Community Health Center in Manchester, the director is Ed George; and the Lamprey River Community Health Center in New Market run by Ann Peters recently won a Federal project designation and was able to significantly expand their ability to treat patients in their area of New Hampshire. Their efforts are noteworthy. That is why this legislation is so important to be able to not only encourage the existing health care centers we have, but to expand them and expand their mission.

So I urge my colleagues to support the bill. I thank the chairman and thank the ranking member for the bipartisan nature of this bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

□ 1245

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the reauthorization of the community health centers for a number of reasons.

First of all, more than probably anything else, community health centers are the reason that I am a Member of Congress. My public work began at a community health center, the Martin Luther King Center in Chicago, then the Miles Square Center in Chicago. I became a member of the association when we organized it, ultimately became chairman of the legislative committee. The current president of the association, Tom Van Coverden, was my staff person when I was chairman of the legislative committee. I became its speaker of the house and eventually became president of the National Association of Community Health Centers. And so I used to be one of those people who would run around here knocking on Members' doors asking them to appropriate money and to support community health center programs.

Community health centers are the best thing that has happened to ambulatory health care since Medicare and Medicaid for large numbers of poor people throughout the country. I commend them. I have been in centers all over the country, and they do outstanding jobs.

They are also the main economic engine in many communities, the biggest employer. People get a chance to work who have never had a job before. I know individuals who are nurses and physicians who came to work in community health centers as aides, as orderlies, who are now professionals. It is

really the best thing that I have ever encountered in health care.

My district, this is the one time that I envy the members of Commerce and Energy because I also have 26 hospitals in my congressional district, probably more than any other district in the country, five medical schools, and so health is a big part of what goes on where I live on a daily basis.

I commend the committee for an outstanding piece of legislation, the great work that it does. And, yes, they are going to have their convention in Chicago in August of this year, and we look forward to hosting them at that time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank Mr. DAVIS for a very inspiring testimonial of the importance of community health centers, and to learn of his longtime dedication to them, and I thank him for that.

I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague as well in thanking Mr. DAVIS for his comments.

I am a huge fan of what I call community-based health centers. These clinics, these health centers do awesome work. So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 5573, the Health Centers Renewal Act, which will reauthorize the Community Health Center program for 5 more years and increase the program's funding. This continues the strong commitment Congress has shown to these centers over the past 5 years.

During the last reauthorization, this administration sought to double the amount of people receiving care through community health centers from 10 million to 20 million. Already nearly 16 million individuals are now receiving quality care, and half of these individuals are uninsured. So of the 46 million uninsured, approximately 8 million are receiving excellent care from these centers.

By preventing costly hospitalizations and reducing the use of emergency care for routine services, it is estimated community clinics save the health care system over \$6 billion annually.

So, in conclusion, I strongly support passage of this legislation so community health centers can continue providing high-quality, cost-effective care. And I thank Mr. DEAL and others, including Mr. GREEN, for bringing this bill out. It is an important bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a good member, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to join in support of this important bipartisan Health Centers Renewal Act, H.R. 5573.

Each and every day health centers provide high-quality primary and preventive care to our constituents. In Illinois, community, migrant, homeless

and public housing health centers operate 268 primary care sites and serve close to 1 million patients every year.

Community health centers do a great deal with limited resources. They provide critical medical care services to many who would otherwise have no other place to go or would end up in an emergency room. They provide early care and chronic disease treatment, keeping people healthy and productive. They are models of accountability and patient involvement.

As the reauthorization bill points out, health centers are community-owned and patient-controlled, an important factor in their ability to reduce barriers to health care access and disparities in health care delivery.

They are also extremely cost-effective. According to the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, Illinois health centers save over \$34 million in State Medicaid expenditures alone. The cost of serving a patient in a health center is about one-third less than in other settings.

As grateful as we are for all the work the community health centers do, it is also important that we recognize that they cannot solve the health care crisis facing our Nation by themselves. We need a vibrant Medicaid program and strategies to expand affordable access to health care for all, especially for the specialty care services that community health centers do not provide.

Finally, I want to take a moment to recognize the outstanding work of the Illinois Primary Health Care Association, which represents the State's community health centers. The association provides important support, not just in advocacy, but in helping health centers learn about and enter the new world of health information technology, IT, assisting in the expansion and construction of new health centers, encouraging culturally appropriate care. We thank them for meeting the new challenges of a growing medically indigent population that is diverse in every conceivable way.

I particularly want to thank the health centers that serve my district so well, centers operated by Access Community Health Network, Heartland Health Outreach, Heartland International Center, Howard Brown Health Center, the Chicago Department of Public Health, and the American Indian Health Service of Chicago. This reauthorization bill is important in making sure that they and other health centers around the country can continue to provide timely, high-quality care to those who would otherwise lack a source of care.

I strongly urge support of H.R. 5573, and encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I would reserve my time pending the right to close.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague and our ranking member on the

health subcommittee, Congressman BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas, Mr. GREEN, who is doing yeoman's work in bringing community health centers to Houston and to his whole State. I thank him for that and thank Chairman DEAL for his good work on this issue.

Every year, a quarter million Ohioans, more than that, 280,000 Ohioans, from Lisbon to Piketon, from Fremont to Chillicothe, from Hough to Lincoln Heights, visit facilities associated with the 27 community health care centers in my State. Many of them are uninsured. Many of them, most of them, have incomes below the Federal poverty level. These centers give these thousands of Ohioans access to a medical home where they can receive a comprehensive range of health care services. Without these centers, many of these Ohioans might opt to delay care. Some of them are likely to end up in the emergency room. Many of them will suffer permanent illness as a result. All of that strains the system, creates unnecessary cost for our health care system, and causes undue bad health and undue human suffering. Investing in community health centers in Mansfield and Youngstown and Barnesville, Ohio, is a far better alternative.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by thanking both our chairman and ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. BARTON and Mr. DINGELL, as well as the chair and ranking member of our health subcommittee, Chairman DEAL and Ranking Member Mr. BROWN, who we just heard from, the committee staff and their hard work on the bill.

There are many of us on the committee with strongly held views about health centers. Some want higher authorization levels, while others sought certain changes in the statute. In the end we came together in a bipartisan fashion to ensure that our differences didn't overshadow our shared support for this important program. And that it has made a tremendous difference in many lives of our constituents.

The bill before us today is truly an example of compromise within our committee, and I would like to thank my colleagues for putting together the good of the health center program above all else when it comes to this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 5573, the "Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006". Community Health Centers are local, non-profit, community-owned health care providers that serve low-income and medically underserved communities. They provide healthcare services to more than 15 million people annually, 6 million of whom have no health insurance coverage. They are located in more than 3,400 communities in every single State, including my home State of Michigan where we have approximately 30 health centers.

Community health centers are vital to the health and well-being of our country's most vulnerable citizens. There are over 41 million uninsured Americans and untold numbers of under-insured persons. This number is increasing at a rapid pace, forcing risky delays for important primary and preventive healthcare services.

For almost 40 years, America's health centers have helped communities meet escalating health needs and address costly and devastating health problems, from infant health development to chronic illness, to mental health, substance addiction, homelessness, domestic violence, and HIV/AIDS. Community Health Centers span urban and rural communities across the Nation and their remarkable success has earned them broad bipartisan support among Federal, State, and local policy-makers. We should continue to do everything within our power to support these health centers and provide them with the resources they need so that they can continue to do their jobs as successfully and effectively as they have for the past four decades.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5573, the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006. Community Health Centers are important resources for our country's healthcare system and vital sources of healthcare for many Americans. Their work, the services and care they provide, and the impacts on the lives of the over fifteen million Americans they serve are commendable. Community Health Centers are important to providing quality healthcare and services to our country's underinsured, uninsured, and underserved communities.

The Northern and Southern Community Health Centers on Guam are two of the more than one thousand such health centers that serve Americans across the country. The Northern and Southern Community Health Centers on Guam are valued and trusted healthcare delivery sites for residents of Guam.

That these community health centers are flexible in their response to the particular needs of the communities they serve is of particular value. This flexibility and ability to adapt to local needs helps ensure that local communities continue to benefit from the high-quality, focused care provided by Community Health Centers such as the Northern and Southern Community Health Centers on Guam. Key among these flexible and locally tailored services is the aggressive outreach, education, and preventative medicine programs these Community Health Centers offer.

But flexible care and services tailored to local needs alone will not ensure that Community Health Centers continue to offer and provide local communities with high-quality, cost-effective healthcare. Community Health Centers, like the Northern and Southern Community Health Centers on Guam, are small and lack significant organic capabilities to earn capital. Continued access to capital to grow these centers and improve their services is vital to their continued success. I strongly support programs that provide Community Health Centers across America access to additional capital resources.

It is only as a result of the efforts of the many professionals within the greater Community Health Center community that its innovative healthcare programs and services can be provided and adequate financial resources can

be best utilized for the benefit of the Center and the community it serves. The Northern and Southern Community Health Centers on Guam are staffed by dedicated professional healthcare providers and support personnel who are committed to delivering the best care possible to their patients. Their efforts to provide high-quality care to residents on Guam are representative of their commitment to our island's unique community. The compassion and level of service they display in carrying out their duties is representative of the highest qualities of professionalism demanded by the medical profession. Lastly, the level of respect they have earned among the medical community on Guam and from the patients they serve on-island is notable.

I support H.R. 5573 and the additional authorization of appropriations for the health centers program established under the Public Health Service Act.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006 (H.R. 5573), which would authorize appropriations for Fiscal Years 2007–2011 for health centers to meet the health care needs of our medically underserved populations.

Health care centers (aka Federally Qualified Healthcare Centers (FQHC)) provide essential services to our communities. More than a thousand FQHCs serve over 15 million people in 3,700 communities across the United States. FQHCs not only provide primary and preventive care, but also meet emergency care needs in their communities. My State of Hawaii has 13 FQHCs across the state, and 10 of which are in my district alone.

We are all well aware of the important role of FQHCs in providing cost-effective, quality health care to our poor and medically underserved communities. FQHCs exist in areas where economic, geographic, or cultural barriers limit access to primary health care for the working poor, the uninsured, and many high-risk and vulnerable populations. More important, these health care centers tailor their services to specific community characteristics and needs.

When Congress established the FQHC system nearly 40 years ago, we intended a unique public-private partnership by providing direct funding to community organizations for the development and operation of these healthcare centers. Federal grants, on average, constitute 24 percent of the annual budget of FQHCs by assisting communities to find partners and recruit doctors and other health professionals. Today's passage of H.R. 5573 will continue that time-proven commitment and mission by helping to reduce health disparities, meeting health care needs, and providing a vital safety net in the health care system across our country and especially in my home.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the Health Centers Renewal Act and urge its expedited passage in the Senate.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and would urge the adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5573.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GME SUPPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2006

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5574) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5574

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. PROGRAM OF PAYMENTS TO CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 340E of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "and each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011" after "for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2005";

(2) in subsection (f)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011, \$100,000,000."; and

(3) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking "subsection (b)(1)(A)" and inserting "subsection (b)(1)(B)";

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "and" at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011, \$200,000,000.".

(b) REDUCTION IN PAYMENTS FOR FAILURE TO FILE ANNUAL REPORT.—Subsection (b) of section 340E of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking "paragraph (2)" and inserting "paragraphs (2) and (3)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIRED.—

"(A) REDUCTION IN PAYMENT FOR FAILURE TO REPORT.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount payable under this section to a children's hospital for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2008 and after taking into account paragraph (2)) shall be reduced by 25 percent if the Secretary determines that—

"(I) the hospital has failed to provide the Secretary, as an addendum to the hospital's application under this section for such fiscal year, the report required under subparagraph (B) for the previous fiscal year; or

“(II) such report fails to provide the information required under any clause of such subparagraph.

“(ii) NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE MISSING INFORMATION.—Before imposing a reduction under clause (i) on the basis of a hospital’s failure to provide information described in clause (i)(II), the Secretary shall provide notice to the hospital of such failure and the Secretary’s intention to impose such reduction and shall provide the hospital with the opportunity to provide the required information within a period of 30 days beginning on the date of such notice. If the hospital provides such information within such period, no reduction shall be made under clause (i) on the basis of the previous failure to provide such information.

“(B) ANNUAL REPORT.—The report required under this subparagraph for a children’s hospital for a fiscal year is a report that includes (in a form and manner specified by the Secretary) the following information for the residency academic year completed immediately prior to such fiscal year:

“(i) The types of resident training programs that the hospital provided for residents described in subparagraph (C), such as general pediatrics, internal medicine/pediatrics, and pediatric subspecialties, including both medical subspecialties certified by the American Board of Pediatrics (such as pediatric gastroenterology) and non-medical subspecialties approved by other medical certification boards (such as pediatric surgery).

“(ii) The number of training positions for residents described in subparagraph (C), the number of such positions recruited to fill, and the number of such positions filled.

“(iii) The types of training that the hospital provided for residents described in subparagraph (C) related to the health care needs of different populations, such as children who are underserved for reasons of family income or geographic location, including rural and urban areas.

“(iv) The changes in residency training for residents described in subparagraph (C) which the hospital has made during such residency academic year (except that the first report submitted by the hospital under this subparagraph shall be for such changes since the first year in which the hospital received payment under this section), including—

“(I) changes in curricula, training experiences, and types of training programs, and benefits that have resulted from such changes; and

“(II) changes for purposes of training the residents in the measurement and improvement of the quality and safety of patient care.

“(v) The numbers of residents described in subparagraph (C) who completed their residency training at the end of such residency academic year and care for children within the borders of the service area of the hospital or within the borders of the State in which the hospital is located. Such numbers shall be disaggregated with respect to residents who completed residencies in general pediatrics or internal medicine/pediatrics, subspecialty residencies, and dental residencies.

“(C) RESIDENTS.—The residents described in this subparagraph are those who—

“(i) are in full-time equivalent resident training positions in any training program sponsored by the hospital; or

“(ii) are in a training program sponsored by an entity other than the hospital, but who spend more than 75 percent of their training time at the hospital.

“(D) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than the end of fiscal year 2011, the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the

Health Resources and Services Administration, shall submit a report to the Congress—

“(i) summarizing the information submitted in reports to the Secretary under subparagraph (B);

“(ii) describing the results of the program carried out under this section; and

“(iii) making recommendations for improvements to the program.”.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 340E of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e) is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2)(E)(ii), by striking “described in subparagraph (C)(ii)” and inserting “applied under section 1886(d)(3)(E) of the Social Security Act for discharges occurring during the preceding fiscal year”;

(2) in subsection (e)(2), by striking the first sentence; and

(3) in subsection (e)(3), by striking “made to pay” and inserting “made and pay”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5574, the Children’s Hospital Graduate Medical Education Support Reauthorization Act of 2006, which is legislation to reauthorize the Children’s Hospital Graduate Medical Education Payment Program for another 5 years.

Without question, Children’s Hospitals are an integral part of this country’s health care delivery system. They improve health outcomes by providing a unique set of specialized health care services and treatment options for children.

The Children’s Hospital Graduate Medical Education Payment Program is designed to provide financial assistance to children’s teaching hospitals which do not receive significant Federal support for their resident and intern training programs through Medicare because of their low Medicare patient volume. By reauthorizing this important but relatively young program, we are able to help ensure that the mission of these teaching hospitals is continued.

I am also proud to say that this legislation makes improvement to the program by strongly encouraging the participating hospitals to report important new data measures to the Department of Health and Human Services.

I am proud to sponsor this legislation with my friend from Ohio and the ranking member of the health subcommittee, Mr. BROWN. And I would

like to thank the 20 members of the Energy and Commerce Committee who joined us as original cosponsors of this bill.

I would also like to commend Chairman DEBORAH PRYCE of Ohio and Chairman NANCY JOHNSON of Connecticut for their strong and continued leadership on this important issue.

Again, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It has been a pleasure working with Chairman DEAL from Georgia to introduce and move this legislation through the House. I appreciate his strong support and concern about funding, of creating an ongoing, more predictable funding treatment for graduate medical education.

Children’s Hospitals, as we know, care for our Nation’s youngest members, helping them grow and thrive. When a child develops a serious illness, these hospitals fight back with every weapon at their disposal, focused expertise, cutting-edge technology, a mission that embraces all children regardless of their family’s income, regardless of their insurance status, regardless of their family’s ability to pay.

Like other teaching hospitals, freestanding Children’s Hospitals, we have many of them in Ohio, in Akron, in Toledo, Columbus and in Youngstown, freestanding Children’s Hospitals make it a priority to pass on their expertise. They train the next generation of children’s health care providers, ensuring a steady stream of physicians fluent and conversant in the unique challenges of pediatric care.

Most of our Nation’s teaching hospitals rely on the Medicare GME program, Graduate Medical Education program, to help cover the costs associated with training new physicians.

□ 1300

However, Children’s Hospitals, as I discovered in Akron Children’s some years ago, which obviously serve few Medicare patients, the program for the elderly, are largely excluded from this funding. Before the enactment of Children’s Hospital GME, this anomaly forced Children’s Hospitals to divert funding from their medical mission to their teaching mission. Two crucial missions, teaching and health care, serving children, one source of funding with no cushion in it, and who is caught in the middle of this funding squeeze? Sick children. It makes no sense to finance Graduate Medical Education for professionals who treat adults but not for professionals who treat children.

In 1999, Chairman BILIRAKIS and I introduced legislation to address this investment gap. Since its enactment, the Children’s Hospital GME program has met and surpassed expectations. Our

Nation's investment in Children's Hospitals enables these providers to simultaneously train tomorrow's pediatric workforce and treat today's young patients, many of whom are battling for their lives. Serious illness is always heartrending, but when serious illness takes a child, it is an unfathomable loss. Children's Hospitals save young lives, and there is no mission more important than that.

Earlier this year, the administration proposed cutting the funding for Children's GME by 66 percent. Such a drastic cut would have devastating effects on the Nation's 60 freestanding Children's Hospitals, including the six that serve my home State of Ohio, and including Ms. PRYCE's Columbus Children's Hospital and have an impact on those like Rainbow in Cleveland that are not freestanding but still need the revenue to train their pediatric specialists. Columbus Children's Hospital alone would have faced a 76 percent cut in GME funding.

My child was at that hospital after an accident once. I know how serious and important they take their work and what a terrific job they do at that hospital in Columbus.

The Bush administration never justified the 66 percent cut. That is not all that surprising since it simply cannot be justified. This program works.

It is true that reckless fiscal decisions, tax cuts during wartime comes to mind, this body and the other body have continued to cut taxes for the wealthiest of our citizens and then logically the President proposes a 66 percent cut in Children's Hospital funding. Those reckless decisions by the Republican majority have plunged the Federal budget into the red. But the President is not doing any of us favors, and both parties recommend that, people sitting on the floor, Mr. MURPHY and Chairman DEAL and Ms. PRYCE. The President is not doing us any favors when he tries to compensate for his fiscal mistakes by making more of them. You would not take pennies from your child's piggy bank to pay off your million dollar yacht. You should not take dollars from our Children's Hospitals to pay off your trillion dollar tax cut. That would be a mistake.

Republicans and Democrats alike reaffirmed our support in committee for full GME funding when we passed this legislation out of the Commerce Committee, which Chairman DEAL and Chairman BARTON led. There is no 60 percent cut in the authorization. There should be no 66 percent cut in the appropriation.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, helps safeguard our Nation's greatest asset: our children. I hope all Members of this body join Chairman DEAL and me in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5574, legislation that will reauthorize and strengthen the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program.

Mr. Speaker, once in a great while, a program stands out among a crowded field of programs that grabs the attention of policymakers. Back in 1999, together with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), we saw such a program and took the reins to bring it to our colleagues' attention.

This program, known as Graduate Medical Education, was great at providing teaching hospitals that served Medicare patients with the tools and resources they needed to train doctors and treat patients. But what we realized was that the program did not reach teaching hospitals that treat children. Obviously, Children's Hospitals do not receive much in the way of Medicare payments. In fact, at the time no Federal program provided Children's Hospitals with the resources they needed to train and retain doctors and treat kids.

So in response to this inequity, Congresswoman JOHNSON and I worked with our colleagues to enact legislation that created a discretionary program to pay for Graduate Medical Education at Children's Hospitals.

Under the strong leadership of Chairman RALPH REGULA of the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriation Subcommittee, Congress has taken the extraordinary step of providing equitable GME funding for independent Children's Hospitals at a level of about \$300 million over the past several years. This program has strong bipartisan support and extraordinary support in my home State of Ohio.

I feel extraordinarily fortunate to have a state-of-the-art Children's Hospital in my hometown of Columbus, Ohio, as was mentioned earlier. At a time when programs are, and should be, scrutinized for their effectiveness and value, I am proud to report on what Children's Hospital in Columbus has been able to accomplish with the funding for the program we are seeking to reauthorize today. In the past 5 years, Columbus Children's has increased the number of physicians trained each year by over 100 percent. It has doubled residency fellowship programs and has launched these programs in areas of local and national shortage, such as pediatric surgical critical care, child neurology, and child abuse and neglect. It has initiated programs for primary care in underserved urban and rural areas. And because the Children's Hospital GME program has provided for the cost of their residency training, just as the Federal Government has always done for adult hospitals, these improvements for education and training of physicians for children have not come at the expense of patient care or research.

What all of this means is that the program is working. It is contributing

to an improvement in the quality of care that our children receive at Children's Hospitals all across America. And that is exactly what our kids deserve.

I want to thank my colleagues, Chairman DEAL and Ranking Member BROWN, for prioritizing the reauthorization of this important program and commend all of the Children's Hospitals across the country for their extraordinary commitment to the health of our Nation's children.

As the motto of Children's Hospital in Columbus states: "For Every Child, For Every Reason." That is what Children's Hospitals are all about and why I am so proud to support this worthy program. I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a psychologist who spent many years working in the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, I was pleased to cosponsor H.R. 5574, the Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006, and I am pleased to speak on the bill today.

The Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program has been of significant help to Children's Hospitals across the country, like Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, whose pediatrics department is also headed by Dr. David Perlmutter. For several years I served on the staff of Children's Hospital in Pittsburgh and remain on the faculty of the School of Medicine at the University of Pittsburgh as an associate professor of pediatrics; so I have seen firsthand through many years the ongoing value of pediatric education for young physicians where they have so much of their learning that comes not from books but at the bedside. Children's Hospitals provide the world class expertise needed to teach the next generation of medical professionals.

Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Roger Oxendale, the president of the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, who summarized the importance of the bill by saying, "The Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program provides the ability to serve all children through clinical care, research, and public health advocacy, as well as its primary purpose of the training of future pediatricians, pediatric specialists, and pediatric research scientists." And this bill, he said, "means a great deal to our hospital and the future of pediatric medicine." That support has really echoed throughout our Nation's Children's Hospitals in terms of the service they provide but also what is needed to keep that ongoing medical education going.

This payment program provides Federal funds to freestanding Children's

Hospitals to support the training of pediatric and other residents in Graduate Medical Education programs. This program compensates for the disparity in the level of Federal funding for teaching hospitals for pediatrics versus other hospitals.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to support this vital and necessary legislation to reauthorize the training for pediatric programs for another 5 years and to ensure that America can continue to meet the health care needs of our Nation's children with high quality.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join Ms. PRYCE and Mr. MURPHY and Chairman DEAL in passing this legislation unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to one of the real leaders in this area, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5574, legislation to reauthorize the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program. Back in 1998, before my colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman PRYCE, and I authored this legislation, Children's Hospitals' residencies were getting .5 percent of what Medicare provided for other teaching hospitals. Thanks to that legislation that we authored and put in place a number of years ago, Federal GME support for Children's Hospitals approaches 80 percent of what Medicare provides to other teaching hospitals. Yes, only 80 percent.

Nonetheless, as a result, Children's Hospitals have been able to increase the number of residents they train, including both general pediatricians and pediatric specialists, increase the number of training programs they provide, and improve the quality of the training they provide and strengthen the programs they provide not only to residents but to the communities.

Between 2000 and 2005 in my own State of Connecticut, the Connecticut Children's Medical Center increased the total number of full-time equivalent residents by 31 percent. About 50 percent of their graduates pursue careers in primary care and 50 percent go on to subspecialty fellowship programs. In addition to so significantly strengthening our capacity to care for children with serious medical problems, they also have introduced new curricula to provide training in community pediatrics and professional development and, indeed, have had a systemic impact on the practice of pediatrics in many settings throughout the State.

I am proud of what they have accomplished. I am proud of what we have done here on this floor and in preceding Congresses to strengthen the training of pediatricians and pediatric specialists, and I urge support of this legislation.

And I thank my colleague, Mr. DEAL, for the work of him and his subcommittee and the full committee in bringing this forward this week.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5574, the Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006. In FY2002, 59 children's hospitals received payments totaling \$276 million. These hospitals provide specialized health care for infants, children and adolescents. Most have a wide variety of pediatric specialists to care for all types of medical problems.

The Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act is of importance to me as it affects many citizens of my congressional district. My district contains 26 hospitals and many are children's hospitals. In Chicago, Advocate Lutheran General Children's Hospital recently opened the world's first Ambient Experience pediatric radiology suite. The project seeks to make children more comfortable potentially reducing the need for sedation and repeat examinations. Federal funding has helped hospitals such as Advocate Lutheran General Children's Hospital the ability to take care of the sick children of Chicago.

Our society must continue to recognize the needs of children. Urie Bronfenbrenner, the co-founder of the national Head Start program, once said, "no society can long sustain itself unless its members have learned the sensitivities, motivations and skills involved in assisting and caring for other human beings." I am pleased that we are continuing to understand the needs of children in our society and that we are continuing to make progress with this issue.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express gratitude for the passage of H.R. 5574, the Children's Hospitals GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006. This bill will extend funding through fiscal year 2011 for children's hospitals that provide approved graduate medical residency programs. Hippocrates once said, "Healing is a matter of time, but is sometimes a matter of opportunity." Kansas City's Children's Mercy Hospitals and Clinics continue to provide numerous opportunities for the children of Missouri and Kansas to receive the best pediatric healthcare available. The services Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education (CHGME) provides are invaluable. The \$7 million received by Children's Mercy Hospitals and Clinics in the Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area trains 125 interns and residents from the University of Missouri-Kansas City Medical School each year. The CHGME program ensures that children will continue to receive excellent healthcare and our Nation's pediatric health workforce will remain strong and competitive for years to come.

Since Children's Mercy Hospital in Kansas City is the only children's hospital between St. Louis, Missouri and Denver, Colorado, I know it is essential to continue to provide this vital funding. These valuable funds will keep the hospitals running efficiently while training our future pediatric care providers. I will support the restoration of CHGME's full funding for \$300 million when the House considers the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2007.

Children's Mercy Hospitals and Clinics provide services spanning from Wichita, Kansas to Springfield, Missouri, and the passage of H.R. 5574 will ensure on-going financial sup-

port for over 60 children's hospitals, including Children's Mercy Hospital in Kansas City where the program started. From heart surgery to brain tumors to burn treatment, patients at Children's Mercy Hospitals and Clinics know they are receiving the best medical care possible and parents will never forget the "angels" who saved their children's lives. I am proud to support a program that has improved the lives of countless children nationwide, especially in my district, Missouri's Fifth Congressional District, while also expressing gratitude to the Missouri and Kansas delegation for their unending support.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in expressing our pleasure at the passage of this bill, and also to Children's Mercy Hospital in Kansas City for providing such a valuable service to so many families. The residents of Missouri's Fifth Congressional District take comfort in knowing the medical experts up at Children's Mercy Hospital are constantly on call ensure our children's well being. The health and safety of our children should remain a national priority, and today, I am proud to be a Member of Congress as we pass H.R. 5574.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5574, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO INCREASE CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS, TREATMENT, AND RESEARCH

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 323) supporting efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 323

Whereas an estimated 12,400 children will be diagnosed with cancer in the year 2005;

Whereas cancer is the leading cause of death by disease in children under age 15;

Whereas an estimated 2,300 children will die from cancer in the year 2005;

Whereas the incidence of cancer among children in the United States is rising by about one percent each year;

Whereas 1 in every 330 Americans develops cancer before age 20;

Whereas approximately 8 percent of deaths of those between 1 and 19 years old are caused by cancer;

Whereas while some progress has been made, a number of promising opportunities for childhood cancer research still remain untapped;

Whereas limited resources for childhood cancer research can hinder the recruitment of investigators and physicians to pediatric oncology;

Whereas peer-reviewed clinical trials are the standard of care for pediatrics and have improved cancer survival rates among children;

Whereas the number of survivors of childhood cancers continues to grow, with about 1 in 640 adults between ages 20 to 39 who have a history of cancer;

Whereas up to two-thirds of childhood cancer survivors are likely to experience at least one late effect from treatment, many of which may be life-threatening;

Whereas some late effects of cancer treatment are identified early in follow-up and are easily resolved, while others may become chronic problems in adulthood and may have serious consequences; and

Whereas 89 percent of children with cancer experience substantial suffering in the last month of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should support—

(1) public and private sector efforts to promote awareness about the incidence of cancer among children, the signs and symptoms of cancer in children, treatment options, and long-term follow-up;

(2) pediatric cancer research to improve prevention, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, post-treatment monitoring, and long-term survival;

(3) policies that encourage medical trainees and investigators to enter the field of pediatric oncology;

(4) policies that encourage the development of drugs and biologics designed to treat pediatric cancers;

(5) policies that encourage participation in clinical trials;

(6) efforts to encourage the incorporation of pain management for pediatric cancer patients into medical education curricula; and

(7) policies that enhance education, services, and other resources related to late effects from treatment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 323, a resolution authored by my colleague, Representative PRYCE of Ohio. This resolution expresses support for efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research.

Just uttering the word "cancer" conjures up a fearful imagery. All of us can name a friend, a neighbor, coworker, or family member whose life has been touched by this terrible disease. Many here today have gone

through or are going through the ordeal of cancer. Thankfully, more and more people are continuing to lead full and productive lives both during and after cancer. And while it is a tragedy whenever cancer takes someone's life, the tragedy is only intensified when cancer cuts short the life of a child.

As a parent and as a grandparent, I can only imagine hearing these dreadful news stories that my child or my grandchild may have been diagnosed with incurable cancer. That would be a terrible story to hear. The impact on families going through such shock and sadness is truly profound. Parents would do anything to cure their son or daughter.

All of us long for the day when a cure is found and cancer is eradicated from the face of the earth.

□ 1315

With advances in science and medicine, we are getting closer every day. But while research for many forms of cancer is vibrant and moving steadily forward, childhood cancer research lags behind in many ways. Promising avenues for research remain unexplored. There are several reasons why this is true. First, because childhood cancer is rare, it doesn't receive the same attention as more common adult cancers.

Second, as a further consequence of this rarity, there is less known about the causes of childhood cancer. This hinders efforts to create effective treatment and prevention strategies.

Finally, because children's young bodies are still developing, they present special problems for administering the powerful cancer therapies that are often used on adults.

The purpose of the resolution before us today is to draw public attention to these issues and to call for increased public and private efforts to address the problem of childhood cancer.

One issue that deserves our attention is the lack of professionals specializing in childhood cancer. We need to encourage more health professionals and students to enter this important field. Work with children who have cancer is a very difficult job and the burnout rate is high. It takes a very special combination of compassion and toughness for a caregiver to remain at a child's side as cancer takes its toll on his or her body.

We need caring people of many backgrounds, including physicians, nurse practitioners, data managers, research assistants and other health care professionals to take childhood cancer research and treatment forward. These professionals can ensure that as many children as possible are able to reap the benefits of research through clinical trials and other opportunities.

While the job of working with childhood cancer patients is tough, the payoff is high. Every ray of a child's smile and every extra day a family spends with their loved one can make all the difference.

Another issue we should consider very carefully is the availability of

cutting edge cancer treatments. Experts say the future of cancer research lies in targeted treatments that are specially engineered to treat an individual person's cancer. These are the so-called designer cancer treatments. Designer treatments can attack a cancerous tumor while saving healthy cells in the body. This approach offers the hope of a cure with fewer side effects.

With the availability of such treatments, there is less need for children to endure difficult chemotherapy and other harsh treatments that may cause severe and lifelong side effects such as blindness and hearing loss.

While designer cancer treatments hold great promise, they require high-tech equipment and a host of specialty trained professionals to make them a reality. Each drug is specially tailored for an individual patient, making the drugs labor intensive and prohibitively expensive to produce.

While we should continue to explore both public and private options to provide these drugs to as many children and adults as possible, we should resist the temptation to impose price controls that would discourage these cutting-edge technologies from coming to fruition. Price controls of all kinds are ineffective in lowering the price of a product and cause more harm than good. Rather than getting the drugs to more people, they will cause fewer drugs to be manufactured and everyone's access will be diminished.

Through research, public awareness, education and wise public policy, we can make strides in the fight against childhood cancer. With this resolution, we are calling attention to the problem of childhood cancer and supporting efforts to improve its diagnosis and treatment.

Again, I commend Ms. PRYCE for her leadership on this issue, and I encourage my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank my Ohio colleague, Congresswoman DEBORAH PRYCE, for introducing this legislation. Ms. PRYCE has been instrumental in raising awareness of childhood cancers and promoting the research needed to overcome them.

Every year, more than 12,000 children in our country are diagnosed with cancer. More than 2,000 of them lose their lives. Although survival rates are increasing and great progress has been made to develop new diagnostics and treatments and cures, cancer remains the number one disease killer of children. There is, of course, no tragedy comparable to the loss of a child. If we can prevent cancer from taking the life of a child, then we must prevent cancer from taking the life of a child.

This resolution calls for Congress to support public and private sector efforts to promote awareness about the

incidence of childhood cancer, its signs and symptoms, its treatment options and its long-term follow-up care. The resolution also calls for increased public and private investment in childhood cancer research, incentives to encourage health care providers to enter pediatric oncology, and incentives to spur development of better pediatric drugs and remedies. There is no more important fight than the fight against childhood cancer.

I think the legislation we just passed on the reauthorization of GME for Children's Hospitals, coupled with Ms. PRYCE's legislation here, will really matter to children in this country. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the author of this resolution, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEAL for making this a priority, and Ranking Member BROWN. I appreciate your words and I associate myself with both of your remarks, and I rise today as a voice for the thousands of families across America who have been touched by pediatric cancer.

Each day, two classrooms full of children are diagnosed, two classrooms, and I rise today for the children who will be diagnosed today and for their families who love them.

This week, we celebrate Gold Ribbon Days, a time for children and their families to come to Washington, D.C., to raise awareness about pediatric cancer. Some of those children are fighting their own battles. To them, we offer support. Some of these families have lost their children to cancer. To them, we offer compassion. And to some of those children who are survivors, they offer us hope.

This morning, I had a chance to spend time with the children and families in town for Gold Ribbon Days. We held a rally right outside the Capitol to tell our stories. We celebrated the fact that this body today would be considering this important resolution that will help raise awareness, education and research. Those families are so thankful, Representative DEAL. Thank you so much for allowing us this time.

We also celebrated the premier tonight of the much anticipated documentary called "A Lion in the House." This film, produced by two brilliant Ohio filmmakers, is extraordinary. It offers an unprecedented look at the cancer journey of five young people and their families over a 6-year period. For those of us who have traveled on our own journey, this film depicts our experiences, our struggles and our pain. For those of you who have not traveled on this journey, this film will give you empathy and compassion.

Never before has such a delicate and serious topic like childhood cancer

been brought to the public's attention in such a powerful and meaningful way; real families sharing stories, the very, very private moments, the highs and the lows, the roller coaster of never knowing what lies around the corner, the confusion, the frustration and the darkness, the joy and the pain, the love and the loss.

The families we meet in the film, their resilience, courage and wisdom, remind us that while it is human nature to question the sanity and injustice of why such a tragedy has befallen those of us who have been touched by pediatric cancer, we must find a way to channel our pain and our anger into action to change the course of this disease. That is what Gold Ribbon Days is all about, and this resolution is part of our action plan.

I want to recognize and thank the pediatric cancer organizations, the advocates, the children and their families who are waging their own battle against cancer. They are the tireless soldiers in our army, and until we rid the world of the scourge that is childhood cancer, we must keep up our strong army and we must keep up the fight, and we shall.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have one final speaker. I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to fight childhood cancer. I would like to especially thank Congresswoman PRYCE for her leadership and strong dedication to this issue, which I can't think of any issue more important than this one.

My father died from this disease, but no parent should ever have to bury a child. As the father of five, I wake up every morning thanking God for the health and happiness of my children. Not all parents are as fortunate.

Unfortunately, cancer is the number one killer of children in this country today, and it destroys not only these innocent victims, but their families as well.

In too many cases, the moms, the dads, the sisters and brothers of children with cancer must stand by a hospital bed and watch helplessly as this horrible disease consumes the life of an innocent child.

Two of my constituents, Tim and Donna Culliver, lost their son Adam to childhood cancer. Faced with the loss no parent could put into words and a lifetime of pain they will feel forever in their hearts, they bravely have chosen to honor Adam by leading the fight to cure childhood cancer and by courageously working to ensure that no other mom or dad has to suffer as they did. And we should help them.

We can and must increase the funding for childhood cancer research. Underfunding this cancer research

delays the goal of finding a cure for children like Adam Culliver. This is an investment we cannot afford to pass up. Unlike many of the investments that we make here in the Congress, this one will actually save the lives of innocent children.

Every day we do get closer to a cure. Three out of four children who are diagnosed with cancer will survive the disease, but that is not good enough. The loss of one child to this disease is too much.

Congresswoman PRYCE and I have introduced legislation called the Conquer Childhood Cancer Research Act, which provides for \$100 million in desperately needed grants for childhood cancer research, and I urge all my colleagues to show their support for this important bill.

I spent the last 2 days with the families whose children have been afflicted by this terrible disease. They gave me a baseball bat that was signed by children at MD Anderson Hospital in Houston. The fortunate thing is that some of the children who signed that bat are survivors. The unfortunate thing is some of the children who signed that bat no longer are alive.

I want to take that bat and get our bill passed through the Congress, and, once and for all, defeat childhood cancer.

Many of my colleagues' offices will be visited today by the families who have suffered through this nightmare. I urge them to listen to the compelling stories the families have to tell and imagine how you would feel if you were in their place, and find the compassion in your hearts to help. This is an issue that no Member of Congress should say no to.

I ask you to fight for these families so no more families will have to suffer again.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, children are one-third of our population and all of our future. If our American way of life fails the child, it fails us all. Today, we have the opportunity to ensure the best healthcare, research and treatment is provided for our children suffering with cancer. Our investment in children will benefit not only their future, but ours as well.

At present, 12,400 children have been diagnosed with cancer. Typically, cancer is the leading cause of death by disease in children under age 15. In 2005, cancer took the lives of 2,300 children. Our limited resources for childhood cancer have hindered the recruitment of investigators and physicians into the field of pediatric oncology. Not long ago, cancer was seen as a death sentence. But today we have hope as survival rates climb and new treatments are on the horizon.

Both public and private sector investments must be made to improve prevention, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, post-treatment monitoring, and long term survival. We should provide incentives to encourage the development of drugs and therapies to treat pediatric cancers. Our American citizens deserve the best in healthcare and we must ensure that they get it.

Let us continue to work together to fight childhood cancer and pass this bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 323, which supports efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research. Childhood is supposed to be a carefree and exciting time filled with joy and wonderment. Too many children, unfortunately, spend their childhood fighting for their lives against cancer. Cancer takes the lives of up to 2,300 children each year. It is imperative that we do more to combat childhood cancer.

The number of childhood cancer survivors is growing. Progress is being made but more must be done. This positive trend must be increased.

To do so, efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research must continue. Increased public awareness of childhood cancer will help increase public and private sector investment in childhood cancer research. More and broader investment will improve prevention, treatment, and long-term survival for cancer patients.

H. Res. 323 provides policies that encourage the development of pediatric treatments and enhances educational resources related to cancer treatments. By supporting H. Res. 323, we demonstrate our support for providing cancer patients adequate resources in medicine and education.

The recent and tragic passing of a young girl, a daughter of Guam, brought this issue to the forefront of the minds of my constituents. Justice Taitague, a 5-year-old who suffered from leukemia, passed away in February 2003. Her best chance for life was a marrow transplant. The first-ever marrow drive on Guam was held as a result of the efforts of Dr. Thomas Shieh, president of the Guam Medical Society, the Hawaiian Bone Marrow Donor Registry, and the National Marrow Donor program. This "Drive for Justice" registered 3,400 donors in 3 days. Awareness of the need to address childhood cancer is high on Guam. But more must be done.

We must continue to promote awareness of, research on, and treatment for childhood cancer research. We must also increase funding to support those activities. I strongly support H. Res. 323, as it will help raise awareness of the need for continued investment of financial resources and intellectual energies toward combating childhood cancer. I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and ask this Congress to pass the Pryce legislation.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I too yield back and urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 323, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further

proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1430

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5573, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5574, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H. Res. 323 will resume tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

HEALTH CENTERS RENEWAL ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5573.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5573, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 3, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie	Berry	Brady (PA)	Carson	Hefley	Michaud
Ackerman	Biggert	Brady (TX)	Carter	Hensarling	Millender-
Aderholt	Bilbray	Brown (OH)	Case	Herger	McDonald
Akin	Bilirakis	Brown (SC)	Castle	Herseth	Miller (FL)
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Brown, Corrine	Chabot	Higgins	Miller (MI)
Allen	Bishop (NY)	Brown-Waite,	Chandler	Hinchey	Miller (NC)
Andrews	Bishop (UT)	Ginny	Choccola	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Baca	Blackburn	Burgess	Clay	Hobson	Miller, George
Bachus	Blumenauer	Burton (IN)	Clyburn	Hoekstra	Mollohan
Baird	Blunt	Butterfield	Coble	Holden	Moore (KS)
Baker	Boehler	Buyer	Cole (OK)	Holt	Moore (WI)
Baldwin	Boehner	Calvert	Conaway	Honda	Moran (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Bonilla	Camp (MI)	Conyers	Hoolley	Moran (VA)
Barrow	Bonner	Campbell (CA)	Cooper	Hoyer	Murphy
Bartlett (MD)	Bono	Cannon	Costa	Hulshof	Murtha
Barton (TX)	Boozman	Cantor	Costello	Hunter	Musgrave
Bass	Boren	Capito	Cramer	Hyde	Myrick
Bean	Boswell	Capps	Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Nadler
Beauprez	Boucher	Capuano	Crowley	Inslee	Napolitano
Becerra	Boustany	Cardin	Cubin	Israel	Neal (MA)
Berkley	Boyd	Cardoza	Cuellar	Issa	Neugebauer
Berman	Bradley (NH)	Carnahan	Culberson	Istook	Ney
			Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Northup
			Davis (AL)	Jackson-Lee	Norwood
			Davis (CA)	(TX)	Nunes
			Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Nussle
			Davis (IL)	Jenkins	Oberstar
			Davis (KY)	Jindal	Obey
			Davis (TN)	Johnson (CT)	Oliver
			Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (IL)	Ortiz
			Davis, Tom	Johnson, E. B.	Osborne
			Deal (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Otter
			DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Owens
			DeGette	Jones (OH)	Oxley
			Delahunt	Kanjorski	Pallone
			DeLauro	Kaptur	Pascarell
			Dent	Keller	Pastor
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Kelly	Payne
			Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy (MN)	Pearce
			Dicks	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
			Dingell	Kildee	Pence
			Doggett	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson (MN)
			Doolittle	Kind	Peterson (PA)
			Doyle	King (IA)	Petri
			Drake	King (NY)	Pickering
			Dreier	Kingston	Pitts
			Duncan	Kirk	Platts
			Edwards	Kline	Poe
			Ehlers	Knollenberg	Pombo
			Emanuel	Kolbe	Pomeroy
			Emerson	Kucinich	Porter
			Engel	Kuhl (NY)	Price (GA)
			English (PA)	LaHood	Price (NC)
			Eshoo	Langevin	Pryce (OH)
			Etheridge	Lantos	Putnam
			Everett	Larsen (WA)	Radanovich
			Farr	Larson (CT)	Rahall
			Fattah	Latham	Ramstad
			Feeney	LaTourette	Rangel
			Ferguson	Leach	Regula
			Filner	Lee	Rehberg
			Fitzpatrick (PA)	Levin	Reichert
			Foley	Lewis (GA)	Renzi
			Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Reyes
			Ford	Linder	Reynolds
			Fortenberry	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)
			Fossella	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)
			Fox	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (MI)
			Frank (MA)	Lowey	Rohrabacher
			Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen
			Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel	Ross
			Galgely	E.	Roybal-Allard
			Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Royce
			Gerlach	Mack	Ruppersberger
			Gibbons	Maloney	Rush
			Gilchrest	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)
			Gillmor	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
			Gingrey	Markey	Ryun (KS)
			Gohmert	Marshall	Sabo
			Gonzalez	Matheson	Salazar
			Goode	Matsui	Sánchez, Linda
			Goodlatte	McCarthy	T.
			Gordon	McCaul (TX)	Sanchez, Loretta
			Granger	McCollum (MN)	Sanders
			Graves	McCotter	Saxton
			Green (WI)	McCrery	Schakowsky
			Green, Al	McDermott	Schiff
			Green, Gene	McGovern	Schmidt
			Grijalva	McHenry	Schwartz (PA)
			Gutierrez	McHugh	Schwarz (MI)
			Gutknecht	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
			Hall	McKeon	Scott (VA)
			Harman	McMorris	Sensenbrenner
			Harris	McNulty	Serrano
			Hart	Meahan	Sessions
			Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Shadegg
			Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)	Shaw
			Hayes	Melancon	Shays
			Hayworth	Mica	Sherman

Sherwood	Tauscher	Wasserman	Boozman	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel	Ross	Simmons	Turner
Shimkus	Taylor (MS)	Schultz	Boren	Gallegly	E.	Roybal-Allard	Simpson	Udall (CO)
Shuster	Taylor (NC)	Waters	Boswell	Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Royce	Skelton	Udall (NM)
Simmons	Terry	Watson	Boucher	Gerlach	Mack	Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Upton
Simpson	Thomas	Watt	Boustany	Gibbons	Maloney	Rush	Smith (NJ)	Van Hollen
Skelton	Thompson (CA)	Waxman	Boyd	Gilchrest	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)	Smith (TX)	Velázquez
Slaughter	Thompson (MS)	Weiner	Bradley (NH)	Gillmor	Marchant	Ryan (WI)	Smith (WA)	Visclosky
Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)	Brady (PA)	Gingrey	Markey	Ryun (KS)	Snyder	Walden (OR)
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt	Weldon (PA)	Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Matheson	Sabo	Sodrel	Walsh
Smith (WA)	Tiberi	Weller	Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Matsui	Salazar	Solis	Wamp
Snyder	Tierney	Westmoreland	Brown (SC)	Goode	McCarthy	Sánchez, Linda	Souder	Wasserman
Sodrel	Towns	Wexler	Brown, Corrine	Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	T.	Spratt	Schultz
Solis	Turner	Whitfield	Brown-Waite,	Gordon	McCollum (MN)	Sanchez, Loretta	Stark	Watson
Souder	Udall (CO)	Wicker	Ginny	Granger	McCotter	Sanders	Stearns	Watt
Spratt	Udall (NM)	Wilson (NM)	Burgess	Graves	McCrery	Saxton	Strickland	Waxman
Stark	Upton	Wilson (SC)	Burton (IN)	Green (WI)	McDermott	Schakowsky	Stupak	Weiner
Stearns	Van Hollen	Wolf	Butterfield	Green, Al	McGovern	Schiff	Sullivan	Weldon (FL)
Strickland	Velázquez	Woolsey	Buyer	Green, Gene	McHenry	Schmidt	Sweeney	Weldon (PA)
Stupak	Visclosky	Wu	Calvert	Grijalva	McHugh	Schwartz (PA)	Tancredo	Weller
Sullivan	Walden (OR)	Wynn	Camp (MI)	Gutierrez	McIntyre	Schwarz (MI)	Tanner	Wexler
Sweeney	Walsh	Young (AK)	Campbell (CA)	Gutknecht	McKeon	Scott (GA)	Tauscher	Whitfield
Tancredo	Wamp	Young (FL)	Cantor	Hall	McKinney	Scott (VA)	Taylor (MS)	Wicker
Tanner			Capito	Harman	McMorris	Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)	Wilson (NM)
			Harris	Hart	McNulty	Serrano	Terry	Wilson (SC)
			Capps	Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Sessions	Thomas	Wolf
			Capuano	Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)	Shadegg	Thompson (CA)	Woolsey
			Cardin	Hayes	Meeks (NY)	Shaw	Thompson (MS)	Wu
			Cardoza	Hayworth	Melancon	Shays	Thornberry	Wynn
			Carson	Hefley	Mica	Sherman	Tiahrt	Young (AK)
			Carter	Hensarling	Millender-	Sherwood	Tiberi	Young (FL)
			Case	Herger	McDonald	Shimkus	Tierney	
			Castle	Herseth	Miller (FL)	Shuster	Towns	
			Chabot	Higgins	Miller (MI)			
			Chandler	Hinche	Miller (NC)			
			Chocoma	Hinojosa	Miller (VA)			
			Clay	Hobson	Miller, Gary			
			Cleaver	Hoekstra	Miller, George			
			Clyburn	Holden	Mollohan			
			Coble	Holt	Moore (KS)			
			Cole (OK)	Honda	Moore (WI)			
			Conaway	Hooley	Moran (KS)			
			Conyers	Hostettler	Moran (VA)			
			Cooper	Hoyer	Murphy			
			Costa	Hulshof	Murtha			
			Costello	Hunter	Musgrave			
			Cramer	Hyde	Myrick			
			Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Nadler			
			Crowley	Inslee	Napolitano			
			Cubin	Israel	Neal (MA)			
			Cuellar	Issa	Neugebauer			
			Culberson	Istook	Ney			
			Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Northup			
			Davis (AL)	Jackson-Lee	Norwood			
			Davis (CA)	(TX)	Nunes			
			Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Nussle			
			Davis (IL)	Jenkins	Oberstar			
			Davis (KY)	Jindal	Obey			
			Davis (TN)	Johnson (CT)	Oliver			
			Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (IL)	Ortiz			
			Davis, Tom	Johnson, E. B.	Osborne			
			Deal (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Otter			
			DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Owens			
			DeGette	Jones (OH)	Oxley			
			DeLauro	Kanjorski	Pallone			
			Delahunt	Kaptur	Pascrell			
			DeLauro	Keller	Pastor			
			Dent	Kelly	Payne			
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Kennedy (MN)	Pearce			
			Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi			
			Dicks	Kildee	Pence			
			Dingell	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson (MN)			
			Doggett	Kind	Peterson (PA)			
			Doolittle	King (IA)	Petri			
			Doyle	King (NY)	Pickering			
			Drake	Kingston	Pitts			
			Dreier	Kirk	Platts			
			Duncan	Kline	Poe			
			Edwards	Knollenberg	Pommo			
			Ehlers	Kolbe	Pomeroy			
			Emanuel	Kucinich	Porter			
			Emerson	Kuhl (NY)	Price (GA)			
			Engel	LaHood	Price (NC)			
			English (PA)	Langevin	Pryce (OH)			
			Eshoo	Lantos	Putnam			
			Etheridge	Larsen (WA)	Radanovich			
			Everett	Latham	Rahall			
			Farr	LaTourette	Ramstad			
			Fattah	Leach	Rangel			
			Feeney	Lee	Regula			
			Ferguson	Levin	Rehberg			
			Filner	Lewis (GA)	Reichert			
			Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lewis (KY)	Renzi			
			Foley	Lipinski	Reyes			
			Forbes	LoBiondo	Reynolds			
			Forde	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (AL)			
			Fortenberry	Lowey	Rogers (KY)			
			Fossella	Lucas	Rogers (MI)			
			Fox		Rohrabacher			
			Frank (MA)		Ros-Lehtinen			
			Franks (AZ)					

NAYS—3

Flake	Hostettler	Paul
-------	------------	------

NOT VOTING—5

Cleaver	Lewis (CA)	Rothman
Evans	McKinney	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1454

Mr. SALAZAR and Mr. STARK changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 306, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GME SUPPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5574, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5574, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 4, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Barrett (SC)	Bilirakis
Ackerman	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (NY)
Akin	Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Alexander	Bean	Blackburn
Allen	Beauprez	Blumenauer
Andrews	Becerra	Blunt
Baca	Berkley	Boehlert
Bachus	Berman	Boehner
Baird	Berry	Bonilla
Baker	Biggart	Bonner
Baldwin	Bilbray	Bono

Boozman	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel
Boren	Gallegly	E.
Boswell	Garrett (NJ)	Lynch
Boucher	Gerlach	Mack
Boustany	Gibbons	Maloney
Boyd	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Bradley (NH)	Gillmor	Marchant
Brady (PA)	Gingrey	Markey
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Matheson
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Matsui
Brown (SC)	Goode	McCarthy
Brown, Corrine	Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)
Brown-Waite,	Gordon	McCollum (MN)
Ginny	Granger	McCotter
Burgess	Graves	McCrery
Burton (IN)	Green (WI)	McDermott
Butterfield	Green, Al	McGovern
Buyer	Green, Gene	McHenry
Calvert	Grijalva	McHugh
Camp (MI)	Gutierrez	McIntyre
Campbell (CA)	Gutknecht	McKeon
Cantor	Hall	McKinney
Capito	Harman	McMorris
Capps	Harris	McNulty
Capuano	Hart	Meehan
Cardin	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
Cardoza	Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)
Carson	Hayes	Melancon
Carter	Hayworth	Mica
Case	Hefley	Michaud
Castle	Hensarling	Millender-
Chabot	Herger	McDonald
Chandler	Herseth	Miller (FL)
Chocoma	Higgins	Miller (MI)
Clay	Hinche	Miller (NC)
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Clyburn	Hobson	Miller, George
Coble	Hoekstra	Mollohan
Cole (OK)	Holden	Moore (KS)
Conaway	Holt	Moore (WI)
Conyers	Honda	Moran (KS)
Cooper	Hooley	Moran (VA)
Costa	Hostettler	Murphy
Costello	Hoyer	Murtha
Cramer	Hulshof	Musgrave
Crenshaw	Hunter	Myrick
Crowley	Hyde	Nadler
Cubin	Inglis (SC)	Napolitano
Cuellar	Inslee	Neal (MA)
Culberson	Israel	Neugebauer
Cummings	Issa	Ney
Davis (AL)	Istook	Northup
Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Norwood
Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Nunes
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Nussle
Davis (KY)	Jefferson	Oberstar
Davis (TN)	Jenkins	Obey
Davis, Jo Ann	Jindal	Oliver
Davis, Tom	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz
Deal (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Osborne
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Otter
DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Owens
DeLauro	Jones (NC)	Oxley
Delahunt	Jones (OH)	Pallone
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Pascrell
Dent	Kaptur	Pastor
Diaz-Balart, L.	Keller	Payne
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kelly	Pearce
Dicks	Kennedy (MN)	Pelosi
Dingell	Kennedy (RI)	Pence
Doggett	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Doolittle	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson (PA)
Doyle	Kind	Petri
Drake	King (IA)	Pickering
Dreier	King (NY)	Pitts
Duncan	Kingston	Platts
Edwards	Kirk	Poe
Ehlers	Kline	Pommo
Emanuel	Knollenberg	Pomeroy
Emerson	Kolbe	Porter
Engel	Kucinich	Price (GA)
English (PA)	Kuhl (NY)	Price (NC)
Eshoo	LaHood	Pryce (OH)
Etheridge	Langevin	Putnam
Everett	Lantos	Radanovich
Farr	Larsen (WA)	Rahall
Fattah	Latham	Ramstad
Feeney	LaTourette	Rangel
Ferguson	Leach	Regula
Filner	Lee	Rehberg
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Levin	Reichert
Foley	Lewis (GA)	Renzi
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Reyes
Forde	Lipinski	Reynolds
Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)
Fossella	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (KY)
Fox	Lowey	Rogers (MI)
Frank (MA)	Lucas	Rohrabacher
Franks (AZ)		Ros-Lehtinen

Flake	Paul
Linder	Waters

NAYS—4

Flake	Paul
Linder	Waters

NOT VOTING—7

Bass	Lewis (CA)	Westmoreland
Carnahan	Marshall	
Evans	Rothman	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1503

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEED FOR BORDER SECURITY

MEDICARE PART D: A FLAWED HEALTHCARE POLICY

(Mr. BISHOP of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, two new reports released yesterday make an open and shut case that the Medicare part D drug benefit is inadequate to meet the needs of America's seniors. One report indicates that drug prices are increasing at four times the rate of inflation. The other report shows that the VA, which negotiates with the drug companies for better pricing, is paying 46 percent less for brand-name drugs than the prices listed by Medicare plans for the same drugs.

Is there any better proof that we should have allowed the government to negotiate for lower prices when we had the chance? How can we explain or justify these exorbitant drug price increases to seniors? The drug companies say it is not their fault and blame the insurance companies, who return blame to the drug companies.

There is really nowhere else to turn except to the Medicare bill, which continues to disappoint, frustrate and anger seniors. Part D works just fine for the drug companies and the HMOs, but it is not working for those seniors who, through no fault of their own, haven't signed up for a plan and will pay for the consequences of a bad plan for the rest of their lives.

Like our energy policy, which coddles oil companies earning record profits, the Republicans' flawed health care policy built around part D rewards the pharmaceutical industry, another coddled industry, at the expense of one of the most vulnerable segments of our population, our seniors.

NEEDED LEGISLATION

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we work toward completing our appropriations work, I think it is important to acknowledge that there are some policy questions of concern.

I have introduced legislation to address the signing statements of the Executive, the President, which allows the President not to veto legislation when he is opposed, but really to send out signing statements that then causes the executive branch to totally ignore the laws of Congress. If we are to have a separation of powers, we need to make sure that Congress has its own powers to pass its laws and have them applied.

I also think it is important to acknowledge that the no-knock decision by the Supreme Court is in and of itself unconstitutional, and I will be writing legislation to put back in place that

the fourth amendment is truly constitutional.

It is important, as well, as we debate the immigration issue that we bring down the tone of divisiveness, and I hope to file a sense of Congress resolution that would encourage all Members of Congress not to divide us on the debate of immigration.

I hope we will pass legislation as well that says no amnesty should be given to those in Iraq who kill American soldiers. I will be introducing legislation on that as well.

CONGRATULATING THE MIAMI HEAT ON WINNING THE NBA CHAMPIONSHIP

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, on a lighter note, it has been said that there is no "I" in "teamwork." Indeed, a successful team beats with one heart. So, I rise today to congratulate the entire Miami Heat organization, Micky Arison, head coach Pat Riley, the Heat players and the entire Miami community for beating with one heart and winning the 2006 National Basketball Association championship.

The Heat became only the third team in NBA history to win the final series after being down two to nothing. For four games in a row, they were too hot to handle.

I know that I speak for Heat fans throughout south Florida and across the country when I say that the Heat could not have made us more proud last night. The entire Heat organization overcame a great deal of individual and collective adversity throughout the season. Yet despite doubters, they proved to have the hearts of champions.

The Heat victory was a true tapestry, comprised of the youthful talent of Finals Most Valuable Player Dwayne Wade and the veteran leadership of Alonzo Mourning, Shaquille O'Neal and Gary Payton. This team truly is 15 strong.

Congratulations to the Heat fans in south Florida, who have patiently waited 18 years for a championship parade on Biscayne Boulevard. There are no fans more deserving.

INCREASE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal minimum wage is now the lowest that it has been, adjusted for inflation, in over 50 years. Here in Congress we have not made an adjustment; we have not given the lowest-income, most hard-pressed economic citizens of our country any raise since 1997.

I thought for a moment that there was a glimpse of hope as we have seen

a proposal that finally passed in the Appropriations Committee that would have made in order an amendment that would have raised it gradually from \$5.15 to \$7.25 an hour. But now we see this is tied up in partisan politics, and it looks as though the Republican leadership is not going to allow the House of Representatives to vote on giving low-income Americans a salary increase.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of Oregon the voters have gone ahead and passed a statewide initiative that provides an automatic increase in the minimum wage, taking it out of politics. It is supported by our public, it is good for our economy, and it is good for our citizens. I hope we can do the same here in Congress.

REDUCING AMERICA'S DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in 2003, we spent \$103 billion buying oil from nondemocratic countries, such countries as Iran, Syria and Venezuela, hardly American allies by any stretch, and, in fact, people who in some ways are funding the war against us in the war on terrorism.

We need fuel independence. We need to pass the bipartisan H.R. 4409, which accelerates the market towards flex-fuel vehicles, ethanol-run vehicles, hybrids, and an assortment of other energy-saving measures. It will, in fact, by the year 2020 reduce our dependence on foreign oil by 20 percent.

We need to drive by a cornfield and say, that is our next tank of gas. The technology is already out there. In Brazil, 40 percent of the cars run on ethanol. In America, only 3 percent of them do.

What we need to do is make it so that this technology is affordable and practical for all households in America. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and pass H.R. 4409.

HONORING POLICE LIEUTENANT GREGORY BENNERSON

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, as I rise this morning, my Virgin Islands community is paying a fond but sad farewell to a favorite son of St. Croix, Police Lieutenant Gregory Bennerson.

Just to speak of his years as a policeman and rise to the position of commander of criminal investigations does not do full justice to his life and contributions. He dedicated much of his free time to youth and involved himself in many activities that uplifted and guided them to be the best they could be.

Greg served as a senator in the 23rd Legislature of the Virgin Islands. He was well on his way to being elected once again, because our community values and needed his consistency, his diligence, his commitment to truth, to values, and to all of the people of the Virgin Islands.

Greg was a devoted son, father, and solid, caring, selfless friend. It was out of this that his humanity became manifest and extended to everything else he did. We are all saddened by his loss, which touches my family and I personally.

Although we grieve, we should take heart that knowing Greg won an even more important election. He now looks over and advocates for us in a far better and all-powerful place. May he rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, my Virgin Islands community is saying a fond but sad farewell to a favorite and favored son of St. Croix, Lieutenant Gregory Bennerson of the Virgin Islands Police Department.

As excellently as he has served the Department—just to speak of—his years of service as a policeman and his rise through the ranks to the position of Commander of Criminal Investigations does not do full justice to his life and contributions.

A young man himself, he dedicated much of his free time to youth and worked with boys and girls clubs, was a PTA president and led the pre-cadet and Police Athletic League, but also involved himself in many other activities that uplifted our youth and guided them to be the best they could be.

He also gave his time and support to domestic violence prevention and the Women's Coalition, as well as to improving health services at the Governor Juan F. Luis Hospital. Greg loved St. Croix and was its dedicated advocate and devoted servant.

First a Republican following in the footsteps of his much revered dad, he became a Democrat and served his adopted party with commitment and passion. Greg served as a Senator in the 23rd Legislature of the Virgin Islands and at the time of his passing he was well on his way to being elected once again. Our community valued and needed his consistency, his diligence, his commitment to truth, to values, to right, and to all of the people of the Virgin Islands.

Though a big tease, with a subtle sense of humor, more than anything else he was a devoted son, father, and solid, caring, and selfless friend. It was out of this that his humanity became manifest and extended to everything else he did.

We are all saddened by his loss, which touches my family and me personally.

As I said in tribute at a gathering at home, although we grieve, we should take heart knowing that Greg won an even more important election. He now looks over and advocates for us in a far better and all powerful place.

May he rest in peace.

□ 1515

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUPPORTING THE WAR ON TERROR

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, there was an historic debate on the House floor last week between both sides of the aisle concerning the war in Iraq. Unfortunately, I got a call late on Wednesday evening that my wife Erica had been rushed to the hospital with a serious medical emergency, and I was absent from that debate because I had to go to my wife's bedside at the hospital. I am happy to report she is at least out of the hospital, although the infection in her hand is still giving her a lot of trouble.

I wanted to at least state my opinion on the war in Iraq and the consequences of American action, and I think heroic action, that is taking place in Iraq and also in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, we are involved in a war on terror. The battle for Iraq and the battle for Afghanistan are clearly part of that war on terror. And if you want to talk about terror, how terrible could it be that what we have discovered happened to two of our fine soldiers, Kristian Menchaca and Thomas Lowell Tucker, who were slaughtered and butchered by our enemy, and we are just learning of the horror of what they did to those poor young men, those heroes, those American heroes who were willing to stand in the gap and be counted so that the people of Iraq can do what they have done, form up a government, make that government functional, get that government to where it is operational so that we can meet our goal.

Our goal is a free Iraq, a democratic Iraq, because, as the President says, when we have free democratic countries, we don't have disputes with those countries that go to war. We are trying to advance the cause of freedom around the world and protect ourselves from people who would slaughter our citizens of this country.

This is not warfare that we are talking about of these people. We are abiding by the rules of war; they are abiding by the rules of terrorism, which is no rule. And that is why we have to continue to take this fight to the

enemy where they are until we have established a victory for the United States. And I honestly believe that victory is on the horizon.

I have made three trips to Iraq. I have visited with individual soldiers in Iraq. They are proud of their mission, they are proud of their accomplishments, they are proud of the things that they do for the Iraqi public. They have stories to share, as one soldier shared with me who was in the hospital and had a rose there with him, about a little girl who gave him that rose and said thank you. He didn't understand the language she was speaking, but he knew it meant thank you.

These troops are doing humanitarian as well as soldierly efforts to make life for the Iraqi people better. But, more importantly, we as American citizens should never tolerate an enemy that would butcher our troops. If there is any amount of decency in these people, they would at least abide by simple, simple rules of war. But they don't. We have had beheadings. We have had slaughter and mutilation of our American corpses.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the right side of Iraq. I am proud that the 4th Infantry Division, which is in my district, and the 1st Calvary Division have been active participants in making life better for the Iraqi public. And, Mr. Speaker, I honor them by standing here today and say I fully support America's war on terror and the war in Iraq. And I apologize that I was not here for the debate, but I am grateful for all those who stood up for the United States of America's effort in the battle of Iraq.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, thank you so much for granting me this time.

As chair of the House Democratic Caucus, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Ranking Member CONYERS, the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Mr. WATT, and the chair of the Hispanic Caucus Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for the great work and the significant sacrifices they gave in helping us to fashion a Voting Rights Act renewal that we thought was acceptable for the vast majority of the Members of this body.

We are extremely disappointed, however, that the leadership of the House has decided to pull the Voting Rights Act which we had hoped to be considering this afternoon.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Judiciary Committee had 12 or 13 hearings, and everybody in this body had an opportunity to come before that committee to let their views be known. Everybody in the voting public had ample opportunity to present their views and their emotions to the committee.

After all of this, we thought we had an agreement that this legislation would come before this body on suspension. We can understand why it was necessary for the Rules Committee to allow two amendments to be offered. We understand politics, and we do not have a problem with that. We do, however, have a problem with raising expectations among the people of this great State and having those expectations dashed as they were today.

We are hopeful that the leadership will bring this legislation before this body before we go out for the July 4 break. I do not believe there is any better way to celebrate this Nation's birthday, which we do on July 4, than by saying to the American people that the Voting Rights Act, which was created to get rid of creative devices that work to nullify and dilute the impact of minority voting in our great State.

I am proud to represent the State of South Carolina in this body. I used to teach history to students in that State. I used to tell my students all the time that one of the reasons that we study history is so that we can understand the past so that we will know pretty much how to prepare for the future. And one of the things I used to tell them, Mr. Speaker, is that if a thing has happened before, it can happen again. And I am afraid that the creative devices that were developed in the 1890s and early 1900s in this country under what we call the Black Codes, things like numbered posts, things like at-large voting, things like what we call full-slate voting, would be allowed back into our electoral process if we politicize section 5 that grants review. And if we were to turn that section over to a political appointee to make determinations as to whether or not they allow to be required other forms of exceptions, that is exactly what we will do with that law.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come today to thank the bipartisan group of legislators on the Judiciary Committee for fashioning an acceptable compromise to bring to this body. And I also ask the leadership of the Republican Party to please bring this legislation to this body next week and give us an opportunity to say to the American people that we will celebrate our birthday on July 4 with an understanding that everybody, irrespective of status, will have their votes counted and counted effectively.

DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats gave the Republicans a gift last Friday. Let me give you a drum roll here. It is a wonderful gift given by the left to the conservatives here in Washington, D.C. Let me tell you what that gift was. It was the Democrat agenda. They call it the new direction.

Someone said after they released this agenda that it was a new direction. When you are going in circles, you are constantly going in a different direction every time you go around that circle. And that is what the opposition party here in this Chamber is doing, they keep going in circles. It is the same old ideas.

They call it an agenda, but it is more like the Cliff Notes for Liberal Lunacy, Mr. Speaker. The theme of their agenda is best described as, well, promise, tax, spend. Promise, tax, spend. It is what they do best. And it is encouraging to see, and it shows a stark difference between the two parties and where we want to take our country, Mr. Speaker.

They say fiscal responsibility. That is one of their agenda items. Well, that is a wonderful thing to advocate, but it is laughable coming from Democrats. Here on this House floor, just this year, the opposition party has asked for \$45 billion in new spending; \$45 billion. And they call that fiscal responsibility. That is just amazing. And do you know what? They want to have all these new spending programs and call it fiscally responsible. Well, how are they going to do that? How are they going to pay for it? By raising every American's taxes. That is how they will do it.

They say roll back the Bush tax cuts. What that means is every American will pay more next year if the Democrats are in control than if Republicans are in control. That is what it means.

Energy policy. Energy policy. They want to lower gas prices and achieve energy independence. It sounds good. It is very good. Their voting record is far different from that. As we proposed ways of exploring for new energy sources, oil and gas, renewable energy, putting forward bold ideas here on the House floor, they just vote "no." We want to put out tax incentives for new innovation and new ideas for energy production. They say "no." We want to drill and explore for energy in Alaska. They say "no." One hundred eighty-four Democrats voted against exploration of ANWR; 196 Democrats voted against the passage of the Gas Act to relieve high fuel prices for every American; 124 Democrats voted against the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which provided tax incentives and energy production improvements.

Look, the Democrats' rhetoric is far removed from the reality of their voting here on the House floor. But let us talk about what they have done to energy. When you constrict the supply of energy and the demand goes up, costs go up for the consumers. As demand rises and supply is constricted, prices go up. It is very simple, basic economics. Well, the Democrats are in favor of constricting that supply and making the costs go up. That is the policies they have advocated.

But let us move on to taxes. As I said, they have all these new spending proposals, but what are they going to do? Let us talk about the tax cuts the

President has implemented in the last 5 years. One hundred eleven million American taxpayers have seen their taxes decline by an average of \$1,800. That is a wonderful thing for the American people. Over 5 million individuals and families will see their income tax liabilities completely eliminated because the President cut taxes across the board. So if you pay taxes, you have received a tax cut, Mr. Speaker, but those that don't pay any taxes didn't receive a tax cut. That is who the Democrats are saying are left behind by tax cuts. Well, it is a basic notion of fairness, Mr. Speaker. If you pay taxes, we have cut your taxes. But if you don't pay taxes, how can we cut your taxes? So I think the American people should remember that when the Democrats talk about Republicans not cutting everyone's taxes.

□ 1530

Let us talk about the economic growth that we have implemented as a conservative party here in the House and the Senate with a good President working hard. We have had real per capita disposal income growth of 8.5 percent increase since 1999.

HONORING AMERICA'S FALLEN IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, we recently marked a sad milestone in the war in Iraq, as the number of Americans fallen surpassed 2,500. We owe it to each of these families to do everything we can to honor the debt of gratitude we owe them, a debt that can never be fully repaid.

Over the past year, I have led 20 other Members of Congress from both parties in reading the names of the fallen in Iraq and Afghanistan into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, each of these heroes stands in the unbroken line of patriots who have dared to die that freedom might live and grow and increase in its blessing.

God bless and keep each of the brave Americans whose memory we honor today: 1. 1st Lieutenant Benjamin T. Britt. 2. Specialist Cheyenne C. Willey. 3. Sergeant Regina C. Reali. 4. Master Sergeant Joseph J. Andres, Jr. 5. Sergeant Myla L. Maravillosa. 6. Specialist Anthony O. Cardinal. 7. Specialist Sergio Gudino. 8. Specialist Dane O. Carver. 9. Chief Warrant Officer Isaias E. Santos. 10. Chief Warrant Officer Richard Matthew Salter. 11. Sergeant Dominic R. Coles. 12. Private Joshua M. Morberg. 13. Specialist Lance S. Sage. 14. Specialist Aaron M. Forbes. 15. Private 1st Class George Anthony Lutz II. 16. Specialist Prince K. Teewia. 17. Staff Sergeant Ayman A. Taha. 18. Private Jonathan R. Pfender. 19. Sergeant 1st Class Shawn Christopher Dostie. 20. Sergeant Marce-

lino Ronald Corniel. 21. Sergeant 1st Class Jason Lee Bishop. 22. Staff Sergeant Christopher J. Vanderhorn. 23. Lance Corporal Ryan S. McCurdy. 24. Corporal Albert Pasquale Gettings. 25. Specialist Ryan D. Walker. 26. Sergeant Jason Lopezreyes. 27. Lieutenant Colonel Michael E. McLaughlin. 28. Sergeant Adam Leigh Cann. 29. Private Robbie M. Mariano. 30. Sergeant Johnny J. Peralez, Jr. 31. Sergeant 1st Class Stephen J. White. 32. Captain Christopher P. Petty. 33. Major William F. Hecker III. 34. Corporal Brett L. Lundstrom. 35. Lance Corporal Jeriad P. Jacobs. 36. Lance Corporal Kyle W. Brown. 37. Sergeant Radhames Camilomatos. 38. Specialist Clinton R. Upchurch. 39. Specialist Robert T. Johnson. 40. Sergeant Nathan R. Field. 41. Civilian Darren D. Braswell. 42. 1st Lieutenant Joseph D. deMoors. 43. Major Douglas A. LaBouff. 44. Major Michael R. Martinez. 45. Major Stuart M. Anderson. 46. Specialist Jacob E. Melson. 47. Specialist Michael I. Edwards. 48. Chief Warrant Officer 4 Chester W. Troxel. 49. 1st Lieutenant Jaime L. Campbell. 50. Lance Corporal Jason T. Little. 51. Lance Corporal Raul Mercado. 52. Sergeant Michael Joseph McMullen. 53. Petty Officer 1st Class Michael Anthony Jordan. 54. Lance Corporal Jonathan Kyle Price. 55. Chief Warrant Officer 2 Kyle E. Jackson. 56. Chief Warrant Officer 3 Mitchell K. Carver, Jr. 57. Corporal Justin J. Watts. 58. Specialist Dustin L. Kendall. 59. Private 1st Class Kasper Allen Dudkiewicz. 60. Chief Warrant Officer 2 Ruel M. Garcia.

This brings our total to 1,957 names read.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to recognize and thank the brave men and women who continue to serve our Nation with distinction in Iraq, Afghanistan and throughout the world.

Our thoughts, our prayers are with you and your families both during your service and after you come home.

God bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DROUGHT SITUATION

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the chart that is being presented here which is a drought monitor and reflects pretty much the current situation in drought.

The interpretation of that map would lead you to understand that yellow

means abnormally dry. The light brown indicates a moderate drought. Brown is severe drought. Red is excessive or extreme drought, and then black or dark brown is exceptional drought.

We can see that a large part or the central part of the country is either in an extreme or exceptional drought, and that is disturbing, but if it only was ongoing for this particular period of time would not be so damaging.

The problem is that this is a 7-year process. We are in the seventh year of this drought, and most of those areas we are beginning to see some patterns emerge that are very disturbing.

This, for instance, is what has happened in some of the cities and towns in my district and in the State of Nebraska, and you see Lincoln, Grand Island, Hastings, Kearney, a minus 27, 28 inches over that period of time. Some other areas in the eastern part of the State are 10, 15 inches down, but if you look at this map, what you will notice is that the western two-thirds of Nebraska, the western half of Kansas, western half of Oklahoma, much of South Dakota, at times North Dakota, Montana, down into Texas, Arizona and New Mexico have experienced this extreme drought and this loss of water.

What that means is the aquifers in most of those areas are declining. The reservoirs are down to where they are 25, 30 percent full instead of 75 to 100 percent full, and as a result, we are beginning to see a pattern that is really very difficult for many of our farmers to continue to combat.

In many cases here, what we have seen is a reduction of herds. As water has been insufficient and pastures dry out, you cannot support as many cows on that pasture, and you have to sell off some of your brood stock, and of course, that has hurt the cattle industry in those areas.

We have also had to compensate by increased irrigation, and of course, that has been very expensive as fuel prices have gone up, as fertilizer has increased in costs by triple, sometimes quadruple over the last 3 or 4 years. Those input costs have squeezed profit margins to the point where many people are not able to survive in farming.

Also, we have seen some rather major changes in agricultural practices, mitigation of drought. For instance, we are now planting more sorghum, which requires less water than corn or soybeans. We are seeing skip row planting where we are not planting every row that we used to because of the lack of water. Using no till, which means that you plant the seeds in the ground without actually plowing up the ground because that causes water to evaporate so that preserves water.

So, a lot of changes have been made, but even so, this has not been enough. We are still seeing all of those problems.

What we are seeing is a major loss of equity in many of these farmers. They simply had to go to the bank and bor-

row more money and sacrifice whatever equity they have built up in their farm or in their ranch. As a result, we are seeing some people now that are teetering on the brink to some degree.

We will see what happens in the rest of this planting season and growing season, but things are getting somewhat extreme and somewhat dire.

2002, 2004, we had some drought relief. We are not sure what will happen because in those years we were able to get an offset, and we went into the conservation security program and secured, roughly, \$3 billion in both of those years for drought mitigation, but this year, again we will be asked for an offset. I really do not know where that is going to come from.

We are concerned, and I am simply on the floor here today speaking, letting people know, make them aware of this thing that has continued now in this year for the better part of 7 years and is really affecting the agriculture sector.

IRAQ AND THE FISCAL YEAR 2007 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House voted on the Defense appropriations bill for the year 2007, and once again, we missed a golden opportunity. We missed an opportunity to pass a bill that strengthens our national security, while at the same time, reflecting the very best of American values.

Foremost among these values is our desire for peace, our capacity for global leadership and our compassion for the people of the world.

Unfortunately, the Defense bill passed by the House, which included a \$50 billion bridge fund for Iraq, came to a grand total of \$431 billion. This amounts to more than all other discretionary programs combined. With this latest appropriation, the war in Iraq now totals \$320 billion.

With this amount of money, we could have given more than 61 million American teenagers a 4-year university scholarship. We could have created nearly 3 million affordable housing units, a process by the way that would in itself have created over 1 million jobs.

Remember, this is the same war that Paul Wolfowitz said could be paid for out of Iraq's oil revenues, the same war that caused Bush economic adviser, Lawrence Lindsey, to be fired when he suggested it might cost as much as \$200 billion.

Three years, more than \$300 billion later, and over 2,500 American soldiers killed and more than 18,000 wounded, and with Iraq's oil still not flowing at the capacity it was before the war, there is still no end in this war in sight. We are still mired in a seemingly endless conflict.

The President still has not told the American people how he plans to bring our troops home, or even what an end to the war would look like. In fact, when pressed, our President, the commander-in-chief, explained that ending the war would be the job of a future President.

Mr. Speaker, this administration likes to claim that those who support the U.S. leaving Iraq are somehow not supportive of our troops, but the very, very opposite is true. Those who would leave our soldiers in harm's way for years on end on a dangerous and ill-conceived mission should ask themselves whether this is the best way to truly support our troops and to truly secure America.

What we need is a smarter approach to national security, an approach that puts sanity back in our Nation's defense policies.

With the help of Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, and Women's Action for New Direction, I have introduced a plan that would do just that. It is SMART security, H. Con. Res. 158, and it represents a sensible, multilateral, American response to terrorism.

SMART security focuses on investments in multilateral partnerships and regional security arrangements, rather than spending billions of dollars for perpetual war and Cold War relics like the missile defense system.

SMART attacks terrorism at its source with an ambitious international development agenda that supports democracy and economic growth in the troubled regions around the world.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it is time for a fundamental change in our national security policy, a change affected through our actions on the ground and through the bills we pass in Congress. Yesterday's Defense bill was a step in the opposite direction.

The first step in the right direction is an end to the war in Iraq. For the sake of our soldiers, their families and our national security, it is time to stop spending billions of dollars on this war, and it is time to bring our troops home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING CHRIS BROWN

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Aristotle once said that, "All who have

meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of empires depends on the education of youth."

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor one of those responsible for educating the next generation of Americans. His name is Chris Brown, who is a principal of Corinne Elementary School in Box Elder County, Utah. Chris is a 2006 recipient of the Huntsman Award for Excellence in Education.

Now in its 14th year, this award was created by one of Utah's businessmen to honor his father who was a teacher. It nominates up to 500 teachers every year. The winner is chosen by a panel of their peers, as well as business and community leaders. They are remarkable people.

Chris Brown originally planned on getting an MBA, but his wife encouraged him to become an educator, and as she said, he "just fell in love with it." He earned a bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degree from Utah State, and then he taught social studies at Bear River Middle School for 6 years before going on to become a principal now at his fourth elementary school.

□ 1545

Chris's focus has been on the students, and it goes beyond the school grounds. Every summer he visits every student who attends Corinne Elementary School to understand their home environment, to reach a friendship with their families, as well as to set goals for the upcoming year. He works hard to ensure that children from all walks of life are provided with the best educational experience.

Chris's wife Sharon, who is also an elementary school principal, says, that to Chris, everything about his job is being with the students. He feels an administrative position should give him time to be closer to students. He is in the classroom every day. He teaches social skills to his students every year. He leaves home between 4 and 5 in the morning, very seldom gets back before 7 at night, unless his wife creates some kind of fit, and he goes to work early and stays late so that he can do his administrative duties at that time and has time for the kids during the day.

He is kind of leader who is always trying to find some kind of positive interaction with his students. He sees them in the classroom often. He believes if the students see him in the classroom, they will know what they are doing is important. Every Monday and Tuesday he is in the classroom visiting every one of them, teaching social skills that would be expected of them.

On Wednesdays he meets with the teachers and the literary teams discussing each student's needs. He wants them to know how to read and gives teachers and aides ideas that fit into the student's ability, not some one-size-fits-all program. On Friday the

students come to Chris's office to pass off their spelling words so that they have a positive interaction with the principal.

Mr. Brown makes sure that everyone stays focused on the most important issue, which is the kids. When a growing class size met his school and was problematic, he reduced the number by creating an additional third class which he himself taught.

At his current school he can be seen on the playground kicking soccer balls with his students at recess. In fact, one parent said, the whole second grade lives for PE with Mr. Brown. She overheard her son Daniel tell a home-schooled neighbor, "You have to go back to school so you can have PE with Mr. Brown."

Chris and his wife Sharon were both brilliant, student-oriented classroom teachers. I know, I team-taught with Sharon. They both have taken the same commitment to kids to the dark side of administration. Chris Brown has gone above and beyond the call of duty. Each student under his care knows that he truly cares about them and that he values them.

His commitment to the students demonstrates the quality of leader and teacher that he is. It is right that he has been recognized with this award by his peers, because he does education right. And, besides, Chris Brown still did the best audience belly dance we ever had at our Renaissance Festival.

It is an honor to recognize Mr. Brown. It is an honor to present him to you as someone who does his job in education right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ PLAN

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, for over a year, the American people have asked in increasing numbers for the Congress and the President to work on a real plan for Iraq. As we all know, the American people have been increasingly frustrated by the lack of progress both there and here.

For one thing, the battle lines have grown beyond Iraq's borders. The continuing U.S. presence in Iraq has inflamed tensions throughout the Arab world, and hostile sentiment is growing. That makes it harder to deal effectively with Iran and harder to achieve stability and security for Israel and the Palestinian people. In other words, the

casualties in the Iraq war are spreading to U.S. strategic and diplomatic interests throughout the Middle East.

The price we pay continues to escalate, and so does the violence. Iraq has become an unlimited front without battle lines and without a visible enemy. That is the Iraq war our soldiers face every single day.

On any given day, the level of violence may be more or less than the day before, but no one doubts that the United States' soldiers patrol and rest a heartbeat away from certain violence and potential death. They live the Iraq war 24/7 and patrol an unlimited front in an open-ended commitment of U.S. forces.

While the President waits for the Iraqi clerics to declare themselves ready to take up government, some in the Iraqi Government itself are demanding to know when the U.S. forces will leave. Now, that might sound ungrateful after all the sacrifice by our soldiers and all the money we have spent. On the other hand, it may be the clearest sign yet that the Iraqi leaders are emerging who recognize that Iraq will never stand alone until it is on its own.

They are not alone in this desire. It is what the American people want. It is what they want to see, an end to the unlimited sacrifice by U.S. soldiers, unlimited expenditures by the U.S. Government, and unlimited battle lines surrounding our troops.

Despite the nature of last week's debate, the American people finally have begun to see this House take a step forward, with 153 Members voting in favor of the Murtha plan for strategic redeployment. It begins to address the military issues associated with projecting U.S. power in a region without keeping U.S. forces in the middle of Iraqi sectarian violence. The Murtha military option does something else. It offers a realistic opportunity for diplomacy to take root in ways both familiar and effective in the region.

For some time I have urged the involvement of the United Nations as a first step to diffuse the focus on hostility directed towards the United States. The more the U.S. is seen as directing people, government, and events in Iraq, the more we prolong the violence. That has been a familiar theme in the Middle East and one that I heard repeatedly last August when I met with civic and business leaders at a prestigious Arab leadership forum in Amman, Jordan.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, who served as National Security Adviser under President Carter, has outlined a vision for Iraq that is a thoughtful roadmap for peace. The nations of the Middle East, including Iraq, have relied for centuries on a gathering of regional leaders to resolve conflicts. It is time to establish a way for that historical process to occur.

Adopting the Murtha plan is the first step. U.N. leadership is second, because it sets the stage for the nations to be-

come involved without military forces and without the balance tipping to any one ideology, including some we absolutely do not support.

Finally, the roadmap leads to a regional conference where those closest to the problem have the most to gain and/or lose in solving it.

Now, the role of the United States at this point would be a role the United States can play better than any other nation in the world. We can help broker peace from the sidelines instead of fighting the war on the front lines. U.S. diplomacy has accomplished miracles over the years. Israel today is better off than it was before President Carter called the parties to Camp David. It is time we make a similar commitment to a peace process in Iraq.

Let the Murtha plan be the foundation block on the road to peace in Iraq. One hundred fifty-three Members of the House voted to support what the American people believe: We can protect the American interests without automatically ordering our soldiers into combat. We can project American military might without occupying a country.

We have a realistic plan for Iraq and a growing desire to see it implemented. It may take an election to start the real discussion about Iraq, but the American people are ready, willing, and determined to have it. The election is coming.

BRZEZINSKI'S IRAQ PLAN MAKES SENSE

Former national security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski suggests that the U.S. could leave Iraq now and create a better and stronger situation.

His simple four-point proposal is (essentially):

1. Washington should quietly ask Iraqi leaders to publicly ask the US to leave, rather than announce arbitrarily a date for the departure. (The catch—If we had any diplomats left in this administration, they could call Ali Sistani and the Kurdish leaders and the top Sunni leaders and ask them to agree to this easily—but the Dubya-Cheney administration's diplomacy quotient is zero!)

2. After such a public request, the US and Iraqi governments would jointly consult on a date for ending the occupation to allow a complete and orderly disengagement.

3. After this, the Iraqi government—not the US—should then also call for a regional conference of Muslim states, some immediately adjoining Iraq, others more distant, to help consolidate internal stability.

4. On leaving, the US should convene a donors' conference of Western states, Japan, China and others with an interest in Iraq's future stability to help with the restoration of the Iraqi economy.

LOWERED VISION

(By Zbigniew Brzezinski)

America's Iraq policy requires a fundamental strategic reappraisal. The present policy—justified by falsehoods, pursued with unilateral arrogance, blinded by self-delusion, and stained by sadistic excesses—cannot be corrected with a few hasty palliatives. The remedy must be international in character; political, rather than military, in substance; and regional, rather than simply Iraqi, in scope.

Rectifying the increasingly messy Iraqi adventure requires understanding its root: the

extremist foreign policy pursued by this administration. Its rhetoric has been demagogic, especially at the very top. Its strategic content has been manipulated by officials preoccupied more with reshaping the security landscape of the Middle East than with maintaining America's ability to lead globally. Domestic support for its policies was mobilized by the deliberate exploitation, as well as stimulation, of fear among the electorate. The Iraq war is not only an outgrowth of this flawed approach to foreign policy, but also its symbol.

Unlike the 1991 war against Iraq, for which more than 80 percent of the cost was borne by America's allies, this time American taxpayers must foot the bill, which is already approaching \$200 billion. The number of Americans dead and wounded is in the thousands and climbing, and the number of innocent Iraqis killed is considerably higher. America's relationship with Europe—which is integral to global stability and to the protection of U.S. interests—has been badly strained. America's credibility has been tarnished among its traditional friends, its prestige has plummeted worldwide, and global hostility toward the United States has reached a historical high.

Most immediately dangerous, the war has focused Arab hatred on the United States. The U.S. occupation of Iraq is now seen by most Arabs as a mirror image of Israel's repression of the Palestinians. The Bush administration's unqualified support for Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's brutal treatment of the Palestinians has created a political linkage between the war in Iraq and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that is evident to almost everyone in the world except the current White House.

The initiatives President Bush took this week point in the right direction, but they are too late in coming and involve too little change in substance. The president now accepts implicitly what top-level administration officials explicitly rejected when I spoke with them just a few months ago: the need for a U.N. umbrella over the U.S. grant of even limited sovereignty to the Iraqi government. The administration, however, still refuses to bite the bullet and make difficult decisions on the role and duration of the U.S. military presence in Iraq or on the larger dilemmas of regional peace in the Middle East.

The administration has yet to confront squarely the fact that the deteriorating situation both in Iraq and in the region will not improve without a politically comprehensive and coldly realistic revision of current policies that addresses four key points: (1) The transfer of "sovereignty" should increase, rather than discredit, the legitimacy of the emerging Iraqi government, and hence it should issue from the United Nations, not the United States; (2) Without a fixed and early date for U.S. troop withdrawal, the occupation will become an object of intensified Iraqi hostility; (3) The Iraqi government should reflect political reality, not doctrinaire American delusions; and (4) Without significant progress toward an Israeli-Palestinian peace, post-occupation Iraq will be both anti-American and anti-Israel.

First, the transfer of nominal sovereignty to a few chosen Iraqis in a still-occupied country will brand any so-called "sovereign" Iraqi authority as treasonous. A grant of "sovereignty" by the United States to the Iraqis—while an American proconsul backed by an occupation army remains ensconced in a fortress in the very heart of the Iraqi capital—will have no political legitimacy. The president's assertion (repeated more than once in his speech on Monday night) that such a transfer will bestow "full sovereignty" on Iraq is Orwellian artifice.

The urgent need is to subordinate, as soon as possible, the U.S. occupation—which is

rapidly alienating the Iraqis—to the visible presence of the United Nations, headed by a high commissioner to whom effective authority should then be transferred. A genuinely empowered U.N. high commissioner could, in turn, progressively yield genuine sovereignty to the Iraqis with much greater prospects of gaining Iraqi public support for the interim government.

The authority of any such high commissioner should extend to the security sphere. The American military commanders in Iraq should retain full discretion to respond to attacks upon U.S. forces in the manner they deem necessary, but any offensive operations they—or other coalition forces—conduct should require explicit authorization from the high commissioner, perhaps in consultation with the Iraqi leaders. That change in command and control would automatically transform the character of the U.S. presence in Iraq from a military occupation to internationally supervised peacekeeping. The U.N. resolution the Bush administration proposed Monday makes token gestures to that end, but it does not fundamentally alter the continued and overt supremacy of the United States in Iraq.

Second, the longer the U.S. military presence lasts, the more likely it is that Iraqi resistance will intensify. It is, therefore, in America's interest to credibly convey U.S. determination to let Iraqis manage (however imperfectly) their own security. Setting a reasonable deadline for the departure of U.S. troops—far enough in the future not to look like a pell-mell withdrawal but soon enough to concentrate Iraqi minds on the need for self-sufficiency—could take practical advantage of the fact that the countryside situation on the ground is currently not quite as bad militarily as necessarily selective TV images suggest.

April 2005—two years after the occupation began—might be the appropriate target for terminating the U.S. military presence. A publicly known date for the departure of U.S. troops would refute suspicions that the United States harbors imperialist designs on Iraq and its oil, thereby diluting anti-American resentments both in Iraq and the region at large. Only a firm deadline for military withdrawal will convince the Iraqis that we truly intend to leave. Conversely, failure to set a date will encourage Iraqi politicians to compete in calling for early U.S. departure.

Admittedly, there is a risk that a U.S. withdrawal will be followed by intensified instability, but such instability would harm U.S. global interests less than continued (and perhaps rising) resistance to a seemingly indefinite U.S. occupation—which, in any case, has not suppressed low-level but widespread crime, violence, and terrorism. That resistance could take the form of intensified urban warfare, such as that waged five decades ago by the Algerians against the French. The United States could doubtless crush such an insurgency with an intensified military effort, but the political costs of such escalation—massive civilian casualties, pervasive destruction, and the inevitable exacerbation of national, cultural, and religious indignities—would be colossal.

The United States should consult with the principal members of its military coalition about an appropriate deadline. A set date of April 2005 could force other states, notably our European allies, to focus on the need for a wider and more ambitious effort to help the Iraqis stabilize and reconstruct their country. The militarily significant members of the coalition (those with 1,000 or more troops in Iraq) are Great Britain, Italy, Poland, Ukraine, and the Netherlands. Their views should be solicited, if for no other reason than because the publics in these countries are increasingly hostile to continued

participation in Iraq's occupation, while some of the officers commanding their contingents in Iraq have been quite critical of heavy-handed U.S. military tactics.

Third, the internationalization of the supreme political authority in Iraq and the setting of a date for U.S. withdrawal will require a redefinition of the oft-proclaimed (but largely illusory) goal of transforming Iraq into a democracy. Democracy cannot be implanted by foreign bayonets. It must be nurtured patiently, with respect for the political dignity of those involved. An assertive and occasionally trigger-happy occupation is no school of democracy. Humiliation and compulsion breed hatred, as the Israelis are learning in the course of their prolonged domination over the Palestinians.

Post-occupation Iraq will not be a democracy. The most that can be practically sought is a federal structure, based on traditional, often tribal, sources of authority within the three major communities that form the Iraqi state: the Shia, the Sunnis, and the Kurds. It would be unwise, however, to demarcate these communities into three territorially defined regions, for that would almost certainly produce intense border conflicts among them. Until the dust settles from Saddam Hussein's dictatorship and the U.S. military intervention, it would be wiser to rely on the traditional arrangements within the more numerous existing provinces—a strategy that could promote political compromise across sectarian lines. The result would likely be a somewhat Islamic Iraq national government that roughly reflected the country's demographic, religious, and ethnic realities.

Fourth, but far from least, the United States must recognize that success in Iraq depends on significant parallel progress toward peace between the Israelis and Palestinians. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the single most combustible and galvanizing issue in the Arab world. If the United States disengages from Iraq before making significant headway toward settling that dispute, it could face a sovereign Iraqi government that is militantly hostile to both Israel and the United States.

Therefore, the United States—if it is to gain any international (and especially European) support for remedying its Middle Eastern dilemmas—will have to clarify its stand on the eventual shape of an Israeli-Palestinian peace settlement. It should by now be clear that the conflict will never be ended by the two parties on their own. U.S. unwillingness to define, even in broad terms, the fundamentals of a peaceful outcome abandons those Israelis and Palestinians who genuinely desire peace to the mercies of their extremist leaders. Furthermore, endorsing Ariel Sharon's goals but ignoring the Palestinian side of any compromise is delaying, rather than accelerating, the peace process—while compounding the suffering on both sides.

To mobilize those Israelis and Palestinians who seek peace, and to convince the Middle East that U.S. occupation of Iraq is not simply a conspiratorial extension of Israeli domination of the West Bank, the United States should more explicitly state its position regarding the six key issues that a final Israeli-Palestinian peace will have to resolve: not only (as Israel demands) that there can be no right of return for Palestinian refugees, and that the 1967 lines cannot automatically become the final frontier, but also that there will have to be equitable territorial compensation for any Israeli expansion into the West Bank; that settlements not proximate to the 1967 line will have to be vacated; that Jerusalem as a united city will have to be shared as two capitals; and that Palestine will be a demilitarized state, perhaps with some NATO military presence to enhance the durability of the peace settlement.

A fundamental course correction is urgently needed if the Middle East is to be transformed for the better. Slogans about "staying the course" are a prescription for inflaming the region while polarizing the United States and undermining U.S. global leadership. A bold change of course—given the gravity of the situation confronting the Iraqis, Israelis, and Arabs more generally, as well as concerned Europeans—could still snatch success from the tightening jaws of failure. But there is little time left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN HONOR OF THE INAUGURAL CARIBBEAN AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Caribbean American community in honor of the first-ever National Caribbean American Heritage Month.

On June 27, 2005, the House unanimously adopted H. Con. Res. 71, my resolution to declare June National Caribbean American Heritage Month. On February 14, 2006, the Senate followed suit, thanks to the work of Senator SCHUMER of New York and Arielle Goren on his staff.

And let me begin by recognizing the many people who helped realize this 2-year bipartisan, bicameral effort, because this was quite a feat. First, I want to recognize our colleague, a great leader on so many issues and especially on health care, Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN from the Caribbean, who has been tremendous in terms of bringing us together to address the issues of health disparities throughout our country and throughout the world.

Also, I would like to thank the Institute of Caribbean Studies, especially Dr. Claire Nelson and her team, for joining us in this effort from the very beginning.

Also, we must recognize our friends from the Caribbean diplomatic corps, who worked so hard to spread the word about this effort both at home in the Caribbean and in their embassies and consulates across the country.

There are so many Members of Congress who supported this effort. In addition to early support from my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and friends of the Caribbean Task Force, the former chair of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Representative Cass Ballenger, was the first Republican to endorse this bill, and his successor, Chairman DAN BURTON, was one of the first to help urge the President to issue an official proclamation.

This was truly a bipartisan effort, with, of course, our chairman Mr. HYDE of the International Relations Committee and our ranking member Mr. LANTOS, who lent their very strong support.

And, of course, we never would have done any of this without our staff. First, let me commend and thank my staff person Jamila Thompson for her leadership and for her commitment to not only this issue and this bill, but for so many of the efforts that she mounts. She has roots in the Bahamas, and she understands the importance of recognizing Caribbean Americans and their proper role and proper recognition in our country.

Also, we had many staff members, Ted Brennan, Jack Scharfen, Paul Oostburg, Dan Getz, and Mark Walker. They all worked in a bipartisan way to make this a reality and really to realize this dream for many, many people.

The Government Reform Committee, Chairman TOM DAVIS, and our Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN. They applauded the passage of this resolution last year and were instrumental in its passage.

And, of course, in the final weeks before the proclamation was issued by the White House, a coalition was formed that was very instrumental in urging the White House to officially declare June National Caribbean-American Heritage Month. This coalition included Senator Mel Martinez from Florida, Ambassador Tom Shannon, State Department's Assistant Secretary for the Western Hemisphere, and Brian Nichols of his staff.

And the Caribbean American community was very active around this effort. It could not have been done without them. From Glenn Joseph and John Felix in Florida; to Jean Alexander and Horace Morancie, Anthony Carter, and so many others in New York; to Shorron Levy in California, this became, quite frankly, an international grass-roots effort. It was really an exercise in democracy. So I am pleased that on June 5, the President responded by officially declaring June National Caribbean American Heritage Month.

And let me also say that we know the Caribbean is as racially diverse and ethnically and religiously diverse as the United States. We have some phenomenal spokespersons who are traveling throughout the country, like Sheryl Lee Ralph and basketball legend Rick Fox. Sheryl Lee Ralph is a

woman of Caribbean descent from Jamaica actually, and is a great actress as well. Her voice on HIV and AIDS, as well as promoting and spreading the word about Caribbean American Heritage Month, will be very valuable in terms of making sure that our entire country knows about the phenomenal contributions of Caribbean Americans.

On a very personal level, my relationship with persons of Caribbean descent began with the late great former member of this body, the first African American woman elected to Congress, Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm. I worked as a volunteer in her historic 1972 Presidential campaign. As a woman of Barbadian and Guyanese descent, Congresswoman Chisholm never forgot her roots and connections to the Caribbean. Her work, whether it was fighting for equal access to education in the United States Congress or Haitian refugees in detention camps, her commitment always stemmed from her faith and her strong Caribbean values.

When the United States-Caribbean relations began to deteriorate over the war in Iraq, the coups in Haiti, and the Cuban embargo, I knew that we needed to go back and really recognize our deep and strong relations with the Caribbean. So we need to send a message of goodwill to the Caribbean American community. So soon we will be introducing the Shirley Chisholm Caribbean Educational Exchange Act of 2006 to provide existing and expanded educational exchanges between our country and the Caribbean.

WHO SUPPORTS THE CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH EFFORT?

The Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and CARICOM Foreign Ministers included the following statement in their joint press release issued at the conclusion of the US-CARICOM Ministerial Meeting held in The Bahamas in March 2006:

"The Ministers and the Secretary of State welcomed the recent resolution of the U.S. Congress to commemorate Caribbean American Heritage Month in June. The resolution is a recognition of the deep and lasting human ties that bind the United States and the Caribbean."

This bi-partisan effort to create a National Caribbean-American Heritage Month is supported by Ambassador Albert Ramdin, Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States, the Caucus of CARICOM Ambassadors in Washington, DC and the following organizations:

The Institute for Caribbean Studies, DC; Caribbean-Central American Action, DC; Caribbean American Chamber of Commerce of Florida, Inc.; The West Indian American Day Carnival Association, NY; Caribbean-American Cultural Association, Inc. of North America (CACANA), FL; Caribbean-American Center of New York; Conference of Heads of Caribbean Organizations of Central Florida; TnT International, Inc.; The Caribbean American Chamber of Commerce and Industry—Greater Washington Area Network; South Florida Caribbean Diaspora Task Force; Trinidad & Tobago Working Women's Committee, DC; Caribbean Association of World Bank Group and IMF Staff, DC; Caribbean American Chamber Commerce and Industry, Inc. (CACCI), NY; Global Exchange, CA; Caribbean Peoples International Collective, NY (CPIC); The St. Lucia Nation-

als Association; Dominica Academy of Arts & Sciences, DC; Metro Atlanta Caribbean Cultural Arts Centre, Inc. (MACCA); The Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA); The Caribbean Voice, NY; Northern California Caribbean American Heritage Month Committee; Central Florida's Caribbean Sun Newspaper; The Guyanese Society of St. Louis; The Caribbean Club in Mount Vernon, NY; Caribbean Professional Networking Series, DC; Caribbean World Arts & Culture, Inc.; St. Kitts and Nevis Association of Metropolitan Washington; The West Indian Social Club of Hartford, Inc.; The Inter-American Economic Council; Sunrise Symphony Steelpan Corporation; Barbados Assoc. of Central Florida; Jamaican American Association of Central Florida; Grenadian-American Educational and Cultural Organization of Central Florida, Inc.; Caribbean and Floridian Association, Inc. (CAFA); Guyanese American Cultural Association of Central Florida; Orlando Carnival Association, Inc.; Alliance of Guyanese Expatriates of Central Florida; Caribbean Students' Association at the University of Central Florida; Jamaican/American Partners in Education, GA; Central Florida Cricket League; Caribbean Bar Association (Central Florida Chapter); Antigua and Barbuda Association of Central Florida; Association of Asian Cultural Festivals, Inc.; Caribbean Community Connection of Orlando, Inc.; Trinidad & Tobago Association of Central Florida; Suriname American Network; Haitian American Support Group of Central Florida, Inc.; Caribbean-Guyana Institute for Democracy; The Indo-Caribbean Council, NY; The Haitian American Historical Society, FL; Caribbean American Intercultural Organization; Sistas-With Style, CA; Dominican American National Roundtable, DC; West Indian Social Club of Hartford, Inc.; Caribbean American Society of Hartford; The Ballentine Group; Jamaica Progressive League; St. Lucian American Society of Hartford. Mico Alumni Association Inc.; Guyanese American Cultural Association; Connecticut Haitian American Organization, Inc.; Barbados American Society of Hartford; Sportsmen Athletic Club & Cricket Hall of Fame; Cultural Dance Troupe of the West Indies; Trinidad and Tobago Steel Symphony; Jamaica Ex-Policeman Association of Connecticut; West Indian American Newspaper; Center for Urban & Caribbean Research; CAYASCO, Inc.; Martin Luther King Jr. Soccer League; Morancie Family Reunion, Inc., NY; Tropical Paradise Restaurant and Juice Bar, NY; Jamaica Nationals Association, DC; Medgar Evers College, NY; Carriacou Charitable Health Services, Inc., NY; The Caribbean World News Network, NY; The Shirley Chisholm Cultural Institute for Children, Inc., DC; Caribbean Research Center, NY; Montserrat Progressive Society of NY, Inc.; The Georgia Caribbean-American Heritage Month Planning Committee, GA; Ainsley Gill & Associates LLC, DC; SOCA Warriors United, NY; The Black Diaspora, NY; Sunrise Symphony Steelpan Orchestra, Inc., NY; Gloria's In & Out Restaurant, NY; Virgin Islands Association, DC; CCB International, Inc., NJ; TATUCA, NY; Callaloo Magazine, NY; Department of African American Studies, Ohio University; Hannah's Place International, NY; Guyana Folk Festival, DC; Caribbean Sunshine Awards, NJ; Trinidad and Tobago Business Association, Inc., NY; RAJHUMARI Center for Indo-Caribbean Arts & Culture, NY; Mauby Media Services, NY; Merrymakers Cultural Association, NY; Caribbean People's Association, NJ; Trin-American Social & Cultural Association, DC; Trinidadian and Tobagonians Inc., NY; Gasparillo Group, NY; Trinidad and Tobago Association of Washington, MA; Caribbean Journal, NY; St. Anthony's Spiritual Baptist

Church, PA; Friends of the Caribbean, Inc., DC; The International Consortium of Caribbean Professionals (ICCP); Tropicalfete.com, NY; St. Louis-Georgetown Sisters Cities Committee, MO; Virgin Islands Association of the District of Columbia (VIA); Patterson Dental Clinic, NJ; Barbados American Society of Hartford, Inc.; TransAfrica Forum, DC; Caribbean-African-American Hotline, Ads, News, Gospel & Global Events (411XCHANGE), NY; Belizean Information & Services International, NY; St. Vincent and the Grenadines Nationals Association of Washington, DC; eCaroh Caribbean Emporium, MA; Caribbean American Weekly (CAW), NY; Council of St. Vincent and the Grenadines Organizations U.S.A., Inc., NY; St. Vincent Benevolent Association; Bequia United Progressive Organization, Inc.; Chateaubelair Development Organization; Club St. Vincent, Inc.; Canouan United Social Organization, Inc.; Friends of the St. Vincent Grammar School; Girls High School Alumnae; Hairoun Sports Club; St. Vincent and the Grenadines Humanitarian Organization; Mas Productions Unlimited; Striders Social and Cultural Organization; St. Vincent and the Grenadines Ex-Police Association; St. Vincent and the Grenadines Ex-Teachers Association; St. Vincent and the Grenadines Nurses Association; United Vincie Cultural Group of Brooklyn; Concerned Americans for Racial Equality, NY; Benevolent Missions of Atlanta, Inc. (BMA); Barbados Association of Greater Houston; Bahamian Junkanoo Association of Metropolitan DC.

H. CON. RES. 71 COSPONSORS (81) DURING THE 109TH CONGRESS

Reps. Becerra, Berkley, Berman, S. Bishop, C. Brown, S. Brown, Bordallo, *Burton**, Butterfield, Capuano, Carson, Christensen, W.L. Clay, Clyburn, Conyers, Crowley, Cummings, D. Davis, J. Davis, Delahunt, Engel, Faleomavaega, Farr, Fattah, *Feeney*, Ford, *Fortūno*, B. Frank, A. Green, Grijalva, Gutierrez, A. Hastings, Honda, Jackson-Lee, Jefferson, E. B. Johnson, Tubbs Jones, Kaptur, Kilpatrick, Kucinich, *Kuhl*, Lantos, Lewis, Lofgren, Maloney, McCarthy, McDermott, McGovern, McKinney, McCollum, Meek, Meeks, Menendez, Millender-McDonald, G. Moore, Nadler, Napolitano, Norton, Owens, Pallone, Payne, Rangel, Rush, T. Ryan, Serrano, D. Scott, Schakowsky, *Shimkus*, Slaughter, Solis, B. Thompson, Towns, Van Hollen, Velázquez, Waters, Watt, Weiner, Wexler, Woolsey, Wynn

H. RES. 570 CO-SPONSORS DURING THE 108TH CONGRESS (65)

Reps. Payne, *Ney*, Christensen, *Ballenger*, Owens, Rangel, Serrano, Hastings (FL), Tubbs Jones, McDermott, Meek (FL), Clyburn, Capuano, Watt, Lewis, A. Davis, B. Scott, S. Bishop, B. Thompson, Norton, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Waters, Cummings, Kilpatrick, Rush, Lofgren, Towns, Grijalva, D. Scott, Majette, Weiner, Meeks (NY), Acevedo-Vilá, Conyers, Kucinich, Wynn, Jackson-Lee, *Sweeney*, Berman, Delahunt, Woolsey, *Feeney*, *Shimkus*, Van Hollen, Engel, Deutsch, Watson, Ballance, Menendez, Berkley, Jefferson, Ruppberger, Lantos, Maloney, Israel, Maloney, Gonzalez, Lacy Clay, Wexler, *Ros-Lehtinen*, Ford, Jackson, Millender-McDonald, C. Brown, D. Moore.

*Republicans are italicized.

CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH, 2006—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

During Caribbean-American Heritage Month, we celebrate the great contributions of Caribbean Americans to the fabric of our Nation, and we pay tribute to the common culture and bonds of friendship that unite

the United States and the Caribbean countries.

Our Nation has thrived as a country of immigrants, and we are more vibrant and hopeful because of the talent, faith, and values of Caribbean Americans. For centuries, Caribbean Americans have enriched our society and added to the strength of America. They have been leaders in government, sports, entertainment, the arts, and many other fields.

During the month of June, we also honor the friendship between the United States and the Caribbean countries. We are united by our common values and shared history, and I join all Americans in celebrating the rich Caribbean heritage and the many ways in which Caribbean Americans have helped shape this Nation.

Now, Therefore, I, George W. Bush, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim June 2006 as Caribbean-American Heritage Month. I encourage all Americans to learn more about the history of Caribbean Americans and their contributions to our Nation.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of June, in the year of our Lord two thousand six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirtieth.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1600

HONORING BRUCE MICHAEL ABRAMS

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge a great friend of mine, but more importantly, a great friend of the San Diego community, Bruce Michael Abrams. On Sunday, June 25, Bruce is being honored at the ninth GLBT Community Tribute Banquet. Upon learning of this award, Bruce stated that receiving the community tribute this year is humbling and a wonderful honor, and at the banquet Bruce will urge people to get engaged and give back to the community. No stranger to being honored, Bruce Abrams has received numerous awards in the past, such as the Douglas Scott Political Action Award and the Liberty Award presented by the Lambda Legal Defense Fund.

Throughout his 20 years of activism, Bruce has used his education and influence to promote positive change and garner needed funds for the whole community. He has emphasized the importance of all people being involved in their neighborhoods and communities.

The Bruce M. Abrams Lending Library at the center is a direct result of what I call progressive philanthropy. Bruce not only helped to start this community resource, he ensured that the library would have a group of supporters who would be able to keep it going throughout the years. Today the library houses more than 2,000 volumes.

His resume of volunteer service includes a long list of current and past board memberships, including the San Diego Democratic Club, San Diego Foundation for Change, Equality California, and the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Since last year, Bruce has served as a city commissioner on San Diego's Human Relations Commission.

No novice to the political arena, Bruce first cut his teeth working on the gubernatorial campaign of Mayor Tom Bradley. Frequently, Bruce holds political receptions, charity benefits and galas at his beautifully decorated home. As I personally know, these events are not mere fund-raisers, but elegant gatherings which bring people together for real communication. Everybody loves the evenings at Bruce Abrams' home.

When not raising the moral consciousness of the world, Bruce works as a probate and planning attorney. He has a B.A. from the University of Oregon and a J.D. from the Thomas Jefferson School of Law. He truly is the "attorney for the community." Bruce, we love you.

AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE FULL ACCOUNTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I know from time to time all of us have to balance our bank books. Now if the discrepancy is \$9, we might ignore it figuring we made a small error.

If it were \$90, most of us would recalculate and discover the error and call the bank.

If the statement is off \$900, we will probably be down at the bank visiting the manager.

If our account is missing \$9,000, we would be on the phone to our lawyer.

At \$90,000, it would probably mean that we were working at Enron.

If \$900,000 were missing from an account, there would probably be a call to the accountant, the IRS and our creditors. Or else we might be a CEO working at a large corporation who lost their bonus.

When \$9 million shows up missing, usually that means contract overruns

or fraud and a government audit is inevitable.

A congressional committee might look into unaccounted expenditures of \$90 million, and we might read about it in the New York Times.

When \$900 million goes missing, corporations collapse, mergers are cancelled, contracts are terminated, inspectors general are appointed, contracts are sometimes banned or fined, and charges are brought to court and people usually begin to take notice.

I point all of this out to ask what should happen when we find out that \$9 billion is discovered by an official investigation to be missing in our contracting accounts for the reconstruction of Iraq relating to one corporation, Halliburton, and oil revenues. Apparently, this administration thinks very little should happen because there has been no further investigation, appointment of a special inspector, a charge against a person responsible, or even any penalty or ban on that corporation which continues to make massive profits from contracts with the U.S. military despite evidence of overcharging, minimal accountability for funds, incompetence, and abuses of international and civil rights.

And if that doesn't concern us enough to act, shouldn't we pause over recent revelations of an additional \$12 billion in unaccounted funding shipped as currency in \$100 bills directly to Iraq from the Federal Reserve? Worse yet is the story we are learning from the funds we can account for and how they have been spent or misspent, stolen or wasted, and how little they have improved the lives of the Iraqi people they are supposed to help.

The expenditures for the Iraq war continue to grow at a rate that is putting our country into levels of spending and debt never seen before. Don't the American people deserve a full accounting of where their tax dollars are going at a time when more money is being spent to allegedly improve the infrastructure and life-style of the people of Iraq than here at home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HARRIS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my time out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of my fellow Caribbean-Americans as

we celebrate the first Caribbean Heritage Month. I want to begin by commending the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) who I was privileged to join in introducing H. Res. 71, which expressed the sense of Congress that there should be established a Caribbean-American Heritage Month, and also to commend and applaud Dr. Claire Nelson and the staff and members of the Institute for Caribbean Studies, and to thank President Bush for making it official by signing the proclamation proclaiming June 2006 as Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Caribbean-American, with family ties to Cuba, Antigua, the Virgin Islands and the U.S., and consider this achievement an important one. The contributions of the people of the Caribbean, which go back even before the birth of this Nation, span every field from sports to entertainment, politics, art and culture to labor organizing, and all are significant and need to be made known to all Americans.

One of the most important persons of Caribbean descent in the founding of this country was Alexander Hamilton, a general in the American Revolution and our first Secretary of State. He was born on the island of Nevis and raised in St. Croix.

In the struggle to end our enslavement, which I am sure was greatly inspired by the successful Haitian revolution, it is noteworthy that Denmark Vessey also came here from St. Thomas in the now U.S. Virgin Islands by way of the Guadeloupe to lead an unsuccessful, but the largest slave rebellion that was ever planned in this country.

The ongoing fight for emancipation and liberation, my fellow Virgin Islander Edward Blyden, along with George Padmore, Marcus Garvey and Claude McKay, were among the first West Indian Americans to become well known and well respected leaders in the African American struggle for racial equality.

Others from the Virgin Islands who also had their roots in other Caribbean islands, like Ashley Totten and Frank Crosswaith, who were born on St. Croix, helped to found some of the major labor unions still operating today. J. Raymond Jones from St. Thomas, also known as the Silver Fox, ran New York City politics in the 1900s, and those are only a few.

Other famous West Indian Americans include former U.S. representative and first female presidential candidate Shirley Chisholm; Franklin Thomas, former head of the Ford Foundation; Federal Judge Constance Baker Motley, the first black woman appointed to the Federal judiciary; activists such as Stokely Carmichael, Kwame Toure, Roy Innis, Malcolm X and Louis Farrakhan; as well as world renowned actor Sidney Poitier; civil rights activist and singer Harry Belafonte; Earl Greaves, philanthropist, businessman and publisher of Black Enterprise; and

now Colin Powell, the first black U.S. Secretary of State, all have made impressive contributions to this country.

Mr. Speaker, the small islands of the Caribbean also wield a cultural influence that have spread to the remote corners of the world. Our culture, notably the music, calypso, reggae, Afro-Cuban and their derivatives, which were created by and large by a people who were long considered marginalized, has spread far and wide and enjoys extensive popularity today.

But more than just our musical influence, Nobel prizes for literature have gone to poets St. Jean Perse of Guadeloupe and Derek Walcott of St. Lucia from among a number of highly regarded Caribbean writers.

Moreover, internationally admired painters Winfred Lam of Cuba and Leroy Clarke of Trinidad and Tobago and Haiti's "naive" artists took inspiration from a complex cosmology born from West African religions and Christianity. And Trinidad and Tobago's carnival was the basis for the breathtaking costumed parades designed by Peter Minshall of Guyana and Trinidad for the Barcelona, the Atlanta and the St. Lake City Olympics.

The most important contribution of all, however, remains the close ties between this country and the nations of the Caribbean. Those ties are not only ties of geography, but of history, and most important of the common ideals of freedom, justice and democracy which guides our nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting and proper that we honor the contributions of the people of the Caribbean to our history and culture.

Indeed, if providence had not made it possible for our Founding Father, Alexander Hamilton, to New York from my home island of St. Croix to further his education and work in New York City, we might not be celebrating the founding of this Nation next week, and instead, have remained a colony of the United Kingdom even today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague who was here earlier, Ms. LEE, to pay tribute to the Caribbean-Americans who have given so much to this country, and to once again thank her and thank the members and the leaders of Institute for Caribbean Studies and to thank the President for the proclamation which named this month, June 2006, Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FORD PLAN IN MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that America is losing its independence as goods that used to be made here are displaced by foreign imports. In fact, America is in unchartered waters today. We have an accumulated trade deficit of nearly \$1 trillion a year.

Today, I want to talk a little bit about super NAFTA and what the Bush administration is planning to lock NAFTA in even tighter in this country and across the continent.

There is something called the Agreement on Security and Prosperity that is being negotiated by the Bush administration very quietly. No hearings are being held in this Congress. Most Americans have never even heard the term, but it really is the successor to NAFTA.

In addition to what it anticipates in terms of a new transportation corridor that will come up through Mexico and the American highway into the United States, it also includes the incentives to major corporations, such as Ford Corporation of our country that is laying off people in our country, now an additional 30,000 jobs to be lost here in the United States, and Ford is planning to employ over 150,000 more workers in Mexico, announcing it will be investing over \$9.2 billion in Mexico.

It is hard to explain to the American people how big that investment really is, but truly it will employ 15 percent or 1 of 7 of all unemployed people in Mexico, so many of them having been uprooted from their farmsteads, because NAFTA included no transition provisions to allow people to have a life and to survive inside of Mexico's rural areas, and over 2 million families have been uprooted from Mexico's farm communities and are doing what, they are moving north to eat.

At the heart of our illegal immigration problem is NAFTA's disruption of the Mexican countryside.

But in any case, this Security and Prosperity Agreement, as it is being called, has no democratic underpinning to it. It is being negotiated by the very same elites that negotiated NAFTA.

And let's look at some of the signs of what is happening. It is suddenly clearer why a company from Spain called Cintra wants to be the gatekeeper on this new highway structure to manage the flow of goods from Mexico, including the hundreds of thousands of vehicles that Ford Motor intends to manufacture in Mexico after making its \$9.2 billion investment there.

Cintra is a subsidiary of Ferrovial, the Spanish transportation company founded by multi-billionaire Rafael del Pino, who is one of the richest people in the world.

Cintra already operates the Chicago Skyway, one of the nodes along the way here under a 99-year concession, and is planning development of the Trans-Texas Corridor, which is another part of this plan.

□ 1615

Cintra is a 50/50 partner with Macquarie Infrastructure Group an

Australian investment bank in another place in America called Indiana, where the Indiana Turnpike, can you believe this, has been leased to a foreign interest. And we are told that Ohio, the State that I represent, might be the next State to unwisely rent one of its major assets to a foreign nation.

Human Events magazine recently had this description. It said, "The North American Super Corridor Coalition is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to developing this international, integrated multimodal transportation system along the international midcontinent trade and transportation corridor."

Where does that sentence say anything about the United States?

Still, this group has received \$2.5 million in earmarks from the U.S. Department of Transportation to plan this NAFTA superhighway as a 10-lane, limited-access road, plus passenger and freight rail lines running alongside pipelines originally laid for oil and natural gas.

One glance at the map of the NAFTA superhighway on the front page of NASCO's Website will make clear that the design is to connect Mexico, Canada and the United States into one transportation system. But guess what is going to happen? If you look at what is going on in Mexico, guess where Mexico is getting most of the parts to put into their production? Not from the United States. They are getting them from China. In fact, a lot of production in Mexico has been moved to China.

So imagine this: Huge container ships continuing to come in from China and Asia, hitting up against ports like Lazaro Cardenas in Mexico, where the workforce earns almost nothing, and the major ports in our country of Los Angeles, of Oakland, all along the west coast, I just wish we were shipping goods out. But right now our longshoremen and our dock workers are loading and unloading containers in the United States.

But you can go around the United States. You can bring in that massive set of shipments from Asia through Mexico and up into the United States.

And imagine if this corridor is then leased, leased to foreign interests who then charge tolls and become familiar with the transportation systems of the United States.

This is the heart of America. This can displace every other major transportation system that we have if this is locked in piece by piece, and we have plenty of evidence that that is exactly what is going on already as an underpinning to this agreement that is being called security and prosperity.

My question is, how much democracy will that agreement actually have in it? Will it be prosperity for all, or just for people who are rich enough to own global companies, like Cintra, that will invest anywhere, don't know the people in our communities, frankly don't care, and are willing to move production anywhere?

The people of the United States had better wake up. We'd better ask ourselves why are Americans having to work so hard for less? Why is it more expensive for them to send their children to college, and then those kids graduate with huge debts? Why isn't your pension plan secure? Why are you having to pay so much more for health care? Why is not your retirement benefit there forever?

Because these kinds of interests don't want you to have it because they are so filthy rich off the investments they are making globally. They don't care about you, they don't care about this country, they don't care about where you come from, and, my friends, they don't care about democracy.

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there is a present and growing interest in our country in the potential for the materials created from stem cells to produce quite miraculous cures. Indeed, we have been working with adult stem cells for more than 30 years, and there are a large number of applications in medicine.

We have been working with embryonic stem cells for far less than that, but because of their primordial nature, the experts in the research field and the medical field believe that there ought to be more potential from embryonic stem cells than there are from adult stem cells.

But the way we now create embryonic stem cell lines presents ethical problems for a large number of American citizens, indeed, I believe, more than half of them, because all embryonic stem cell lines now are produced by destroying embryos. But because of the potentially vast potential for application of embryonic stem cells to medical cures, there is an increasing interest in the possibility of ethically creating embryonic stem cell lines or embryonic cell-like lines of tissues. And that is what we are going to spend a few moments talking about this evening.

I am joined on the floor this evening by Representative OSBORNE, who has a longstanding interest in this subject. And I would like to recognize him now and to commend him for his knowledge and interest in this subject. Congressman OSBORNE.

Mr. OSBORNE. Thank you, Mr. BARTLETT. I appreciate your expertise, your knowledge in this area. And my remarks will be relatively brief because you are the one that truly understands your bill and understands the research much better than I.

But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that nearly all of us have been impacted, either directly or indirectly, by diseases

like juvenile diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, Lou Gehrig's disease and spinal injuries. And there has been a great clamor over the last 7 years, since embryonic stem cells have been recognized as a possible source of cures for these diseases, that there should be public funding of embryonic stem cell research.

The ethical dilemma, obviously, for those of us who are prolife, who believe in the sanctity of life, is that we would like to see research occur that is helpful, but we don't really want to see human embryos destroyed in the process. And I think that is what brings Mr. BARTLETT and I to the floor together this afternoon, our common interest in some research of this type, but an aversion to the destruction of human embryos. And so I really applaud him for what he has done and for his bill and just make a few comments.

I think the ethical dilemma really revolves around when does life begin. And for some people it is at 9 months. For some it is at birth. For some it is at 3 months, 6 months. But for a great many of us, it is at conception. And if that is your belief, then an embryo constitutes a human life, so what happens to that embryo is of great concern.

And so the research that we are going to talk about this afternoon has to do with allowing research with human embryos that does not harm or destroy the embryo. And therein lies, I think, the interest that I have in this particular process.

There have been a few studies done just recently that I would like to refer to. This came from the National Institute of Neurological Disorders. It is published by the National Institutes of Health. And this is the quote. I believe that this was posted June 21, just a day or two ago. "For the first time, researchers have enticed transplants of embryonic stem cell-derived motor neurons in the spinal cord to connect with muscles and partially restore function in paralyzed animals. The study suggests that similar techniques may be useful in treating such disorders as spinal cord injury" in humans. And, of course, this was done primarily with mice. But that is just recently, in the last couple of days, where paralyzed mice have actually had some of their motor functions and some of their paralysis reversed through a process that has not resulted from the destruction of human embryos.

The second study I would like to mention was published on Monday, October 17, 2005, in the Washington Post. It said, "Two teams of scientists provided the first definitive evidence yesterday that embryonic stem cells can be grown in laboratory dishes without harming healthy embryos, an advance that some scientists and philosophers believe could make the medically promising field more politically and ethically acceptable."

And I think this was pretty much the genesis of the gentleman's bill and his

research. So, rather than taking further time from the expert, I am just going to offer my words of support, my appreciation for his knowledge in this area.

He is, to my understanding, the only geneticist in the House of Representatives, the only one with the adequate scientific understanding to truly bring this forward. And so I applaud you for your research and your stance and for the promise that your bill holds for many of us.

And as many of us know, the President has talked about vetoing any bill that would result in future destruction of human embryos. We believe this is an answer to that concern and a way around that veto.

And so with that, Mr. BARTLETT, I yield to you and thank you for your work.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Thank you. I appreciate you mentioning that recent article on the application of stem cell therapy to these paralyzed mice and the quite miraculous response.

It is kind of ironic and teleologically difficult to explain, to understand why the nerve tissue outside the central nervous system can heal itself. If you cut your hand or your leg, and you lose feeling in your finger or your foot, by and by that feeling will return as the nerves grow. If you cut a nerve in the central nervous system, it doesn't regrow, which is why there are so many paralyzed people from spinal cord injuries and from diseases like multiple sclerosis and so forth.

Stem cell applications provide the hope that we might be able to grow nerve cells and implant them in these patients so that they could recover some activity. And this paper that Congressman OSBORNE referred to in mice gives us hope that that is a real possibility.

Mr. Speaker, I have here in this chart a very abbreviated sequence in the fertilization and the development of the embryo. It begins here with what is called a zygote. A zygote is made up of the two germ cells which have united up here before this one is shown. And then it goes through several developments, through the morula stage and the blastula stage. The blastula is shown here. And finally, the gastrula. And these are sequence. And you will see more of this in the next chart.

But when we get to the gastrula stage, we now have the production of what is called three germ layers. This cell that began up here as a single cell produced by the chromosomes that came from the ovum, the female sex cell, and the sperm, the male sex cell, have now divided again and again and again, and finally these cells begin a process which we call differentiation. They are now differentiating into what will ultimately become all the organ systems of the body.

In this early differentiation, we have what we call the three stem cell lines. We have the ectoderm, which is the ex-

ternal layer; the mesoderm, meaning middle; and we have the endoderm. These we refer to as the three germ layers. And then, of course, we have also the quite unique germ cells themselves. In the female that will, of course, be the ovum from the ovary. In the male it will be the sperm from the testicle.

□ 1630

Now, in each of these three basic germ cell lines, we have a stem cell, which in the ectoderm, it will differentiate into your skin, it will differentiate into your nervous system, the central nervous system, the spinal cord and all the nerves in your body. The mesoderm, the stem cells there will differentiate into the major part of your body. All the muscle, the cardiac muscle, the skeletal muscle, all of the bones, and all of the blood develops from the mesoderm.

The blood is particularly interesting because persisting even in the adult are stem cells for producing blood cells because we keep producing blood cells. They keep breaking down and are removed from the circulation by the liver and the kidney; so we keep producing new ones. So even in the adult, you can see these stem cells, which produce a great variety of blood cells. In the bone marrow, it produces the erythrocytes and the thrombocytes and what we call the polymorphonuclear leukocytes, which are part of the white cells. And then we have the endoderm. There is not much mass of endoderm in our body. That doesn't mean it is not important. The pancreas, the thyroid gland, and the lining of our intestinal system and the lungs and so forth all originate from endoderm.

It is very interesting that these cells retain their original inheritance kind of even in the adult. When you are 50, 60 years old, if you get a cancer and that cancer metastasizes, if it is a cancer on mesodermal tissue, it will metastasize only to other tissues that develop from mesoderm. That is really quite interesting that they have retained that much of their original characteristics, of their original selectivity.

The next chart shows in a little more detail the fertilization process and the development of the embryo. And I am spending a couple of minutes on this, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is important to understand what is being done in the scientific world and what the ethical problems are for those who believe that the embryo is a person in miniature with all of the genetic capabilities to produce a complete human person and therefore it ought not be destroyed.

This is a reproductive tract of the female here, and it shows the vagina and the uterus, and then it shows the two fallopian tubes. And the little square here indicates what is shown in this big chart here. It is just one half of the reproductive system. Here the uterus is split in half. There would be another

mirror image of this on the other side. And it shows here that the ovary, they mature roughly one a month in a female, once every 28 days. And then the ovum erupts from the ovary, and it is almost always, not always but almost always, picked up by a kind of a funnel end of the fallopian tube, which is called the infundibulum.

Once in a while it is not picked up and the ovum will go on out here in the body cavity, and the sperm, which are released, of course, down in the vagina. They go up into the uterus, and then they swim against the current, by the way, because there is some little cilia in here. This ovum has no motility on its own, and it slowly moves down the fallopian tube by cilia in the walls not shown here, which are beating and moving it down, and the sperm swim against that. And some of them will make it out the end of the fallopian tube clear out into body cavity, and if there is an ovum out there, they may fertilize it. And then the fertilized ovum will implant on some adjacent body tissue, and we call this an ectopic pregnancy. Of course, the body is not meant to develop a baby out there; so that needs to be interrupted by surgery or the mother may die.

But as the little diagram here shows, here are the sperm coming up and they fertilize the egg way up into the fallopian tube several days before it will implant down in the uterus. There is quite a miracle that happens here. There are millions of those sperm, and as soon as one of them makes it through the wall of the ovum to fertilize it, there is immediate chemical change in the wall of the ovum and no other sperm can get through because it would be absolutely disastrous if another sperm got through. That would produce when we call polyploidy, and that would result in the death of the embryo. Now, polyploidy reacts very differently in the plant world because that is how we make giant flowers and super fruits and vegetables and so forth.

We simply produce polyploidy, and that makes everything brighter and better and sweeter smelling. But in animals, humans and all other animals, this polyploidy would produce death.

So now the egg is fertilized, and we call it a zygote. So now here is the zygote. It begins its trek down the fallopian tube, and it takes several days. Here we have day 4 and day 5 and day 6 and 7, and you see it is going up around day 7, 8, or 9 before it finally implants in the wall of the uterus. But as it goes down the fallopian tube here, it divides to produce two cells.

Then it divides again to produce four cells and then eight cells, and we will come back to talk about this eight-cell stage because it has a special significance in one of the techniques that may be exploited to produce some ethically generated embryonic stem cell lines, and then it goes on to divide. Again, it goes through the morula stage and then it goes to the blastula

stage and then the gastrula stage, and we saw that on the previous chart.

I would like to note that it is about here at the inner-cell mass stage, about at this stage, that the embryo is generally taken, not, of course, from the reproductive tract because all of this can also be done in a petri dish in the laboratory. You simply superovulate the mother and she may produce a dozen or so eggs, and you wash those eggs out, and then you put them in a petri dish and expose them to the sperm, and they fertilize.

And then they begin to develop, and they grow and develop into all of the different stages that we see here. And so in the petri dish when they have developed to the inner-cell mass stage, which, remember, is the stage where we saw that they were going to develop into the three germ lines, this is the stage at which they take the cells. They simply kill the embryo, and they take the cells from the embryo to produce an embryonic stem cell line.

Several years ago the President issued an executive order that said that we could not use Federal money if we were getting our stem cell lines from destroying these embryos but we could use Federal money in continuing with research on stem cell lines that were then in existence. The President said, and some may have indicated that that was the case, that there were probably 60 or so stem cell lines in existence then. If there were, they have now dwindled to about 20, more or less, stem cell lines, all of which are contaminated with mouse feeder cells.

I might spend just a moment to indicate what these feeder cells are. When we take these cells out of the inner-cell mass, these cells really do not like being alone or even nearly alone. They like company. And so they frequently put them in the company of other cells so that they can reproduce because, if separated, it is more difficult to get them to reproduce. So taking them from the fellowship they find in the embryo and putting them in a petri dish to tissue culture them, many of them will refuse to divide. But if you put them in the company of other cells, in this case the mouse feeder cells, then they divide. Well, this has now contaminated these present stem cell lines so that none of them can be used for therapy. It does not disqualify them for research; so some meaningful research is still going on.

There are four different potential approaches to producing embryonic stem cells without harming embryos or embryonic stem cell-like cells that could produce tissue cultures. And we have a bill, H.R. 5526. This is a companion bill to the Santorum-Specter bill in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the politics of this is that we have a bill that has been in the Senate for quite a while known as the Castle bill, Mike Castle from Delaware.

What this bill does is to permit the use of Federal money to take some of those surplus embryos which are in our

reproduction clinics. When a mother goes in to have in vitro fertilization, as I indicated, they will superovulate the mother with hormones. They get a number of eggs, they will fertilize them in a petri dish, and then they get a dozen, more or less, embryos. They then look at these embryos under a microscope, and they choose the best two or three and implant them in the mother's uterus because they do not all take. My daughter-in-law has just gone through a procedure, and at first, we thought that she had twins, and now it is just a single baby, for which we are very thankful.

The fertilized eggs which are left which have now become embryos are frequently refrozen. The parents pay to refreeze them to keep them, because something may happen to this baby and maybe they will want a second child or a third child, and they will stay frozen for quite a while; so they put them in the freezer. But by and by, they will decide that they do not want more children; so they will no longer pay for keeping the eggs frozen in which case, the fertilized eggs, they are simply discarded. And what the Castle bill says is that parents donate these embryos that are going to be discarded anyhow to medical research and to the development of stem cell lines that, hopefully, will provide miraculous cures of many diseases that Congressman OSBORNE mentioned, for which we now hold out high hopes.

The problem that pro-life people have with this is if you are looking generically at 400,000 surplus embryos, and that is about what is out there, about 400,000, you may make the argument that if they are going to be discarded anyhow, why not get some medical good from them? But there are two problems that pro-life people have ethically with this. One is that before you decide to destroy the embryo, you are going to look at it under the microscope to make sure it is healthy because you are going to want to get cells from a healthy embryo.

So it is not 400,000 embryos that you are concerned with now. It is one embryo under the microscope. And when you are looking at that embryo under the microscope, it could be the next Albert Einstein, it could be the next Beethoven. And, again, we are not dealing with the 400,000 out there. We are dealing with the one under the microscope. That is the one for which we have responsibility, and how could you kill the next Einstein or Beethoven?

And another concern that the pro-life community has is that if we permit the destruction of these surplus embryos, who knows, but what we may be producing more surplus embryos so we will have more embryos to use for establishing stem cell lines? So there is a real need, Mr. Speaker, to develop techniques to ethically get embryonic stem cell lines or embryonic stem cell-like lines that will have the potential of embryonic stem cells.

Just a moment to talk about how embryonic stem cells are different

from adult stem cells. Adult stem cells have already gone through a lot of differentiation. They are either of ectodermal, mesodermal, or endodermal origin. They are already destined to become nerve tissue or muscle or blood or the lining of the gut or something like that. And it is true that we can sometimes kind of reverse that differentiation, and we will talk about that in a few moments. And it is also true that even without doing that, you can make some applications to the development of tissues for that specific part of the body. But because of their primordial nature, because of their ability, we call it pluripotency. They can produce any tissue in the body. Totipotency means that they cannot only produce every tissue in the body, but they can produce every tissue that the embryo needs so that it can develop into a full baby. See, the embryo is not just an embryo because about half of the tissues of the early embryo end up with what we call trophoblast or the amnion and corion which attaches the baby to the mother's wall, protects the baby in an enclosed, warm fluid environment while it develops during its 9 months.

□ 1645

These ethical concerns have resulted in a lot of study by a lot of people to see if there is a way of doing it, where we can get the potential from these embryonic stem cell lines, which any one line can produce any and every tissue in the body theoretically.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are not there yet, because these embryonic stem cells, much like an energetic teenager, just want to divide. They want to do things. They want to grow.

There are some who feel that their tendency to just grow and divide is going to be very hard to control and you are going to end up producing tumors and cancers and that sort of thing when you put them in the body. But there are a lot of knowledgeable, professional people out there who believe that we can control that, that there is incredible potential from these embryonic stem cell lines, so we are trying to get embryonic stem cell lines or embryonic-like stem cell lines that avoid these ethical confrontations.

The next chart shows us three of the four that were looked at by a special commission that the President set up on bioethics. Several years ago they looked at the various possibilities out there and they looked at the pros and cons, and they have a little white paper on this subject which is worth the hour or so that it takes to read it because it goes through all of these techniques and it looks at the pros and the cons of these techniques.

First, we have here kind of a recapitulation of some things that we have been talking about. This shows the development of the gummies. They go through a process of division, and they divide again and again. Most of those divisions are what we call mitotic divisions, where the chromosomes

split and the daughter cells have as many chromosomes as the original cell.

But once in that process there is a division which we call a meiotic division, called meiosis, and in that division the chromosomes split and half of them go to one cell and half to another cell, and that produces a gamete or a sex cell which has only half the requisite number of chromosomes, which we call the haploid number of chromosomes.

Of course, the design now is that these two cells will come together in a process which we call fertilization, when the sperm will fertilize the egg, and then we have the single cell embryo, and then it divides and here we have the 3-day and the 5- to 7-day embryo, which we saw in more detail in previous charts.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot these days about cloning. Dolly the Sheep was the first cloned mammal, and this little sequence here shows how they do cloning.

What they do in cloning is to take an egg cell, and this egg cell has a big cytoplasm, this is what is outside the nucleus, and it has the nucleus. The nucleus contains a lot of genetic material. It contains most of the genetic material that determines whether you are going to be a person or a frog, or whether you are going to be a male or a female.

But out in the cytoplasm are other proteins, protein-like substances, that have a lot of genetic capability too. What they do is pretty much control what goes on in the nucleus. So we have these RNA, ribonucleic acid out there, and these factors now control what goes on in the nucleus.

So if you take an egg and you take the nucleus out of the egg and then you take a donor cell, this is a somatic, which means body, take a cell from the body, and you now combine, you fuse these two cells, you take the cytoplasm from the egg nucleus from the donor cell, and you now have the nucleus from the donor cell in the environment of a cytoplasm from the egg and the factors in that cytoplasm now which control what happens inside the nucleus, with—everything is not detailed here. We kind of shocked this a little bit so the nucleus from the donor cell forgets it is the nucleus from a donor cell, so it now can be controlled by these control factors out in the cytoplasm.

This is now called cloning. So now we have an organism produced that looks nothing like the egg from which you took the nucleus. It now looks like the adult from which you took the somatic cell. So this is what cloning is.

By the way, we will have a chart a little later which shows this. Nature has been cloning for a very long time in a way, because every time we have a set of identical twins, one of them is a clone. I guess you could choose which one of the two you wanted to say was the clone. We will have a chart on that in a few minutes.

The next chart here shows three of the four techniques that are outlined in this report put out by the President's Bioethics Council.

Altered nuclear transfer. I showed the cloning one, because this is very much like cloning. As a matter of fact, the techniques you go through are the same laboratory techniques you go through with cloning.

But what you do here is to knock out a gene for normal development, and you do that before you put the nucleus in the sex cell from which you have removed the nucleus. So you now have deactivated a gene which is necessary for the complete development of the embryo. That gene happens to control the development of what we call decidua, which is the amnion and the chorion.

This cannot develop into a baby because it can't produce an amnion and a chorion, and so it is just a growth of tissues, all the kinds of tissues that are in a baby but not a baby, because you deactivated the gene necessary for the normal development.

What you do later, then, is turn that gene back on. It can never begin a baby. You turn that gene back on so the cells are normal cells, and then you can take cells from that to establish an embryonic stem cell line.

One can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the ethical objections which may be raised to this. But this is simply kind of a crippled child that you have produced here. We don't kill crippled children after they are out of the womb. Why should we kill crippled children produced in the laboratory?

Mr. Speaker, there is almost no technique against which some ethical objection could not be levied. In life, we are always making choices. When you look at the potential good from embryonic stem cell research, there is a level of risk that one is willing to take.

Every time I get in my car and drive down here to the Hill there is a risk involved. Not everybody who drives from Frederick down here makes it down. Every once in a while there is a fatal accident on the way down here. But the value of what I am doing here I believe exceeds the risk that is involved in coming here, and so I come. It is that way with this nuclear transfer.

The second one of these is embryo biopsy, and I will come back to that in a little more detail later, because this is one I have been personally involved with for a number of years now. I spoke to the President about this before he came out with his executive order and have been working with people at NIH. So I will reserve more discussion of this until we come to a couple of charts a little later.

But let me just indicate that what one does here is to envision removing cells from an embryo without harming the embryo and then using the cell which you have removed to produce a tissue culture of embryonic stem cells. Then if you implant the cells remaining in a mother, they go on to produce

what appears to be a perfectly normal baby.

When I first suggested this several years ago, I did not know in the meantime there were going to be laboratories which were doing precisely this. It started in England, and now there are more than 2,000 babies born worldwide where a cell is taken, generally from the eight cell stage. Generally they get two cells, and they have taken that cell to do a pre-implantation genetic diagnosis.

This is to make sure the baby is not going to be mongoloid or have a genetic defect. If they find no defect from that single cell they have taken out, they implant the remaining cells in the mother, and more than 2,000 times now we have a perfectly normal baby, what appears to be a perfectly normal baby born.

Mr. Speaker, I would be surprised if there was any effect. In a former life, I was privileged to get a doctorate in human physiology. I taught in medical school. I had a course in advanced embryology, and I knew that whenever we had identical twins, that half of the cells were taken away from the original embryo and each half became a perfectly normal baby.

So I argued and asked the researchers at NIH 4 or 5 years ago, was this a rational argument? I argued that if you could take half the cells away from the embryo and each half produced a perfectly normal baby, certainly you could take one or two cells away from the embryo and the embryo wouldn't even know it.

Now we have the potential for something which really is quite exciting, which we will come to a slide a little later and discuss that in more detail.

The last one here of these three, this altered nuclear transfer here and the embryo biopsy and cells from dead embryos, I have several slides in a few moments that we will go over cells from a dead embryo.

Many of these embryos are just not going to make it, which is why the clinician looks at them under the microscope before he implants them in the mother. They now have done a lot of observation and research to determine how early you can identify an embryo which is in effect dead. But like the person who is dead, you can still take organs from the person that are perfectly good for implanting in another person, and we do that all the time.

So it occurred to the researchers in this area that maybe when the embryo was dead, and by that we mean it did not have the ability to further divide, it was not going to become a baby and you could clearly identify that state, that maybe the cells in the embryo, at least some of them, were still quite normal and quite viable. So this whole procedure now presumes that we can identify dead embryos that are not going to make it, but they still have life, good cells in them.

So this procedure would be very analogous to taking organs from that

young fellow who rides the motorcycle, my wife calls them "donorcycles," and he has an accident and he is brain dead, but his tissues are still quite good, so they take the tissues from this dead person and implant them. We do that all the time. So there was a thought, and research, observations, seem to verify that indeed there is the possibility of doing that.

The next chart shows us a fourth technique, which is a very exciting one. If, in fact, we can do this, this holds enormous potential, because now we can avoid all of the rejection phenomena.

You see, if you develop a tissue from a embryonic stem cell line or an adult stem cell line and you now put that tissue in a person, it is foreign to them and it will be rejected. So we have a lot of medicines we give which makes them very susceptible to infections and so forth. We have medicines we give them now so they won't reject this tissue.

But in this reprogramming, you now could potentially take a cell from the patient and you could reprogram that cell. What they are doing here to reprogram is exploiting these very fascinating and powerful control factors which are out in the cytoplasm.

Here we have an embryonic cell and it has a cytoplasm, and you can crush the cell and you can now put the nucleus of the donor cell in, or infuse it with this stuff from the embryonic stem cell, and it will now control the nucleus and de-differentiate it and take it back to its primordial state so it now behaves as if it were a embryonic stem cell.

□ 1700

The only possible ethical criticism of this is that where do you get these sex cells to begin with? Well, if you get them by superovulation of the mother, there is some medical risk in superovulation. There is also the possibility, though, that we could dedifferentiate by subjecting them to some sort of a chemical, which would have the same effect on them as these control factors in the cytoplasm here; it is referred to as cell soup, and there are these little polypeptides in there that, like polypeptides that are in a ribonucleic acid which can control what happens in the nucleus. But you may also be able to affect what they do by subjecting them to some sort of a chemical which would kind of reprogram them.

And then the last thing here at the bottom simply looks at stem cells from mature organs. And the one that I mentioned, which is one frequently used, is from the bone marrow, because even in the adult, even today I still have stem cells in my bone marrow because my bone marrow is always making white blood cells and red blood cells and thrombocytes. They are the little cells that are responsible for the clotting of your blood.

Next, I have a chart, and I think there are several of these that look in

more detail at Dr. Landry. And Dr. Landry is the one who first made the suggestion. He has proceeded with some vigor to explore the potential here for getting cells, good cells, from a clinically dead embryo. And, of course, the first thing you had to do was to develop a criteria for embryonic death. You need a dead embryo that still has good cells. And, again, let me use the analogy of the dead person from the auto accident who still has good organs. So this is a dead embryo who still has good cells. And it says here that we need a diagnostic test for embryonic death, because if one researcher is going to use cells from an embryo that he says was dead, there has to be some verifiable basis for declaring that the embryo was dead so other people would understand. So obviously it would be dead if he kills it, but it needs to be dead before he takes the cells from it.

Death is a question of medical fact, not law. We can't write a law that says what death is. And, indeed, clinical death now is not defined by law, it is defined by medical fact.

And these embryo do die, and they watch them. They are not dividing. They watch them for several days. They do not divide, and ultimately they just deteriorate, and they are gone. So the argument is that if you can identify when, in fact, they will never go on to develop an embryo, that at that point they are dead as far as any ability to produce a baby is concerned, and if you now do not wait for the several extra days to which deterioration would occur, the point of death, like the point of death from an auto accident where you can get good organs, at the point of death of the embryo, and when it will no longer develop into a baby, you now can take cells from which you can just have the stem cell lines.

The next chart shows a little more detail of this, and what it shows is that embryo 2 is dead. It shows that you can look at the embryo, and they look different, and it can be documented that, in fact, the embryos that are not going to go on to divide at a certain stage in their development look different. You can identify, you can say of a certainty this embryo will go on to divide, this embryo will not go on to divide. And so you can now make that determination. And when we have developed the techniques for this, and when we have determined that, in fact, we can develop stem cell lines from these, then we will have potentially a technique for getting embryonic stem cells without the destruction of an embryo because the embryo is already dead.

The next chart just is more detail of this. We can look at that quickly.

New criteria for embryonic death and natural history study of arrested embryos. They are arrested; that is, that the development stops at a certain stage. It won't continue beyond that. They observed 444 nonviable in vitro fertilized embryos; 142 were arrested at

the stage of an immature morula, about day 5, and we saw it in one of the previous charts. And they determined that these embryos were not going to divide because they just kept looking at them, and they ultimately deteriorated.

So if they, in fact, have good cells, and they have taken cells from these embryos, and then cells, in fact, are viable, and they can be cultured, and so with more research on this, this is a possibility for getting embryonic stem cell lines.

The next chart shows what happens in twinning. And it was this knowledge about I guess it was 5 years ago now when before the President gave his Executive Order, there was an open house at NIH, and staff and members were invited out to talk with the researchers at NIH about the potential for embryonic stem cell research. And there were a lot of staff members there; I think I was the only Member there. And I remember thinking as we were talking about embryonic stem cell research that this is what happened. And it doesn't always happen at this stage, by the way, but this shows the development of twins splitting at the inner cell mass stage. The inner cell mass splits; now the embryo splits in half, and now you have two babies. This also could occur at the two-cell stage. It splits in half at the two-cell stage. And you know roughly when it split by how the babies present. In this case, the babies present in two separate amnions. If it is split here at the two-cell stage, they present in a single amnion.

But what this told me was that obviously you could take cells from an embryo and not hurt the embryo, because in this case half the cells are taken from the embryo. This half went on to produce a baby, and this half went on to produce a baby. So if you could take half the cells from the embryo, and each half produced a normal baby, then why couldn't you take a cell or two from the embryo without hurting the embryo? And I asked the researchers at NIH shouldn't that be a possibility? And they told me, yes, that should be a possibility.

And I was in an event with the President and mentioned this conversation to him, and a couple of days later Karl Rove called and said that he had followed up on this at the President's request, and they couldn't do that. I said, "Karl, either they didn't understand your question, or they are funning you, because these are the same people that can go inside of a cell and take out the nucleus and put another nucleus in the cell. And they are telling you they can't take a cell or two out of these big embryos? Of course they can." And a female sex cell is big. That ovum is a giant cell compared to the somatic cells that they are taking a nucleus out of.

So he said, "I will go ask them again." And so he went back and asked them again. He came back and said, "ROSCOE, they tell me they can't do

that." So the President came down with his Executive Order which says that the only stem cell lines we can use Federal money to do research on are those that are now already in existence.

It was a couple of years after that when NIH researchers were sitting in my office that I learned what had happened. Mr. Speaker, this is illustrative of what happens so many times in our society. When we think we are carrying on a dialogue, we are really carrying on simultaneous monologues, and there was just a misunderstanding.

What they told him was that they weren't sure that they could develop a stem cell line from a single cell taken from an early embryo. And that was true. He interpreted it as saying that they couldn't take the cell from the early embryo. Well, what we wanted to do with our research was animal experimentation, which would determine whether or not you could develop a stem cell line from a single embryo. And, as luck would have it, Mr. Speaker, the medical community has kind of almost passed us by now, because in the 5 years since I first started exploring this with NIH and then the White House and then a number of meetings with NIH since then, as I mentioned, in England they have developed techniques for taking a cell from an early embryo, the H cell stage, in the laboratory, doing a preimplantation genetic diagnosis, making sure there was no genetic defect, and then implanting the remaining cells, the embryo, in the mother, and more than 2,000 times worldwide now we have what appears to be a perfectly normal baby born.

I keep saying what appears to be because we haven't watched these babies for 60, 80, 90 years, however long they will live, to make sure there is no defect. But I would be enormously surprised, and so would the professional community, enormously surprised, if there are any defects. Because if there were, then every twin ought to have a big defect because they represent only half the cells from the original embryo.

In our conversations with a number of people, we were talking with Richard Doerflinger, who represents the Council of Catholic Bishops. And I really want to credit him with making an incredible contribution to this dialogue, because what he said was, "ROSCOE, what you do with that first cell you take is not a preimplantation genetic diagnosis. What you do with that cell is to establish a repair kit." So that now any time during the life of this baby, 1 year, 10 years, 50 years, 80 years old, when they have a medical problem that could benefit from the development of tissues from embryonic stem cell line, it can be developed from their embryonic stem cell line because you have got this repair kit available for them.

What this did, Mr. Speaker, is to open up the possibility when we are using Federal funds of avoiding, I think, any ethical concern, because the

parents will have already made two decisions: one, to do in vitro fertilization; and, secondly, to take a cell to establish a repair kit and maybe to do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis if they want to take a second cell. And frequently they get two cells rather than one from this early embryo, and it doesn't matter if you take one or two, the other cells go on to produce a perfectly normal baby.

So if this is a potential for the future, the stem cell lines could be achieved by simply asking the parents to donate a few cells from their repair kit. So now the decisions made to get to the repair kit have been decisions that parents make in what they think is the best interest of their child. They want to have one, they can't have one naturally, so they do in vitro fertilization, and they want to make sure that the child has the protection of a repair kit.

And, by the way, we kind of do that now when we freeze cord blood. Cord blood has nowhere near the potential of a cell taken from this early embryo, but it is that person, and for whatever you can get from it, at least there are going to be no rejection phenomena.

The next chart shows a bit of one of the pages of the white paper on the President's Council on Bioethics, and I have highlighted here. It may be some time before stem cell lines can be reliably derived from single cells. Again, this was written now in about late 2001 or 2002, but since that time we have had two researchers, Verlinsky and Landry, both of whom claim that they have developed a stem cell line from a single cell. That was what NIH thought might be difficult to do, but there are now two researchers who say they have done that.

They say it may be some time that stem cell lines can be reliably derived from single cells, extracted from early embryos, and in ways that do no harm to the embryo. Well, they have more than 2,000 babies born by extracting these cells. But, again, if we simply use surplus cells from a repair kit, we have avoided, I think, any meaningful ethical objection.

But the initial success of the Verlinsky group's efforts, I mentioned Verlinsky and now Landry more recently, and note here an asterisk. And they say, "A similar idea was proposed by Representative ROSCOE BARTLETT as far back as 2001." And you can see it has been for 5 years since I have been pursuing this possibility.

The next chart and our last chart kind of is a summary, Mr. Speaker, of what we have been talking about. And what this does is to look at the classical development when you go to the eight-cell stage, and then it develops into a blastula, and you can now either implant that in the uterus, or you can kill it to get stem cell lines.

□ 1715

You can now either implant that in the uterus or you can kill it to get

stem cell lines. Ethically, that is not something that I am comfortable with. It is not something I think a majority of our people are comfortable with, or you can go through what we have just gone through, take a single cell from this blastomere here and implant the remaining cells, let them develop, implant them and then develop a stem cell line from this single cell, then the altered nuclear transfer that we talked about.

This kind of summarizes the potential from those two techniques, and again, what we have done to make this ethical is altered nuclear transfer. We have shut off one of the genes in the cytoplasm so that the nucleus now cannot be induced to make all of the tissue necessary to produce a baby. It produces all of the tissues necessary for baby, but not the tissue necessary for growth of the baby in the womb, the amnion and the chorion.

The important thing, Mr. Speaker, is, and I want to be politically correct for just a moment here. It is not just that we want to do things that are politically popular. We certainly do not want to do things that are politically unpopular because we all like to get re-elected and return here, but we want to do things which have medical meaning.

The Senate, I believe, very shortly is going to vote on the Castle bill. The President has said that he will veto that. Many people, and they come to our offices, these children with diabetes and so forth, people who have relatives who have Parkinson's disease or any one of the wasting diseases of the nervous system that might be treated with this, and they are incensed we are not doing something about this and using their money to develop what they think is enormous potential from these stem cell lines.

The President will veto because he is devoutly pro-life for which I respect him. He will veto the Castle bill. We need to have on the President's desk not just for political purposes, although I think that is important, but because of the enormous potential from embryonic stem cell lifelines, we need to have a bill on his desk that will permit the use, the ethical use, of Federal funds to produce these stem cell lines from which we might get enormous good.

The miracles of medicine have increased lifelines. I just passed my 80th birthday. I am wondering when I am going to enter mid-life. My grandfather would have never thought of entering mid-life after his 80th year, but we have really miracles of medicine today, and this provides miracles greater than we have seen.

Now we have enormous potential here, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, we have the political courage to do the right thing for the American people and get this bill, along with the Castle bill on the President's desk so that the President has a bill which promises the miracles, potential miracles of embryonic stem cell research ethically.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MANNY CORTEZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Manny Cortez.

I am profoundly heartbroken by the untimely loss of my dear friend who passed away last Sunday. I adored Manny Cortez and will be forever grateful for his help, his support, his love and his friendship. He was a wonderful human being and a true gentleman.

Manny was more than just family man and a dedicated public servant. He was a visionary who helped shape southern Nevada as we know it today and who worked tirelessly to turn Las Vegas into the world's most famous travel destination.

Manny earned worldwide respect as a leader for Nevada's tourism and hospitality industry. Under his leadership, the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority became the gold standard against which all others in the business are judged. His lasting legacy will shape southern Nevada as it continues to grow in the 21st century.

Whether as a public servant or as a private citizen, Manny was dedicated to making southern Nevada a better place to raise a family, run a business, or just to visit. Las Vegas would not be the city it is today without the hard work, vision and dedication of Manny Cortez.

My deepest sympathies go out today to the Cortez family. I know I speak for countless others when I say our community has lost not only a remarkable man, but a true leader who left his unique mark on southern Nevada and its top industry.

I am truly blessed to have been able to call Manny Cortez my friend.

More than any of his truly remarkable accomplishments that Manny could claim over the course of his political and professional career, I know that his family meant more to him than all the accolades or money in the world.

Come this November, I know he will be smiling, knowing that the same call to serve and the same desire to give back to the community that motivated him to seek and serve on the Clark County Commission was at the very heart of his daughter's campaign, Catherine's campaign for Attorney General of Nevada.

Manny Cortez was born on April 29, 1939, in Las Cruces, New Mexico, the oldest of two children of Edward Cortez, a baker, and the former Mary Tapia.

The Cortez family moved to Las Vegas in 1944. As a youngster, Manny attended St. Joseph's grade school and graduated from Las Vegas High.

Manny Cortez attended Nevada Southern University, which later be-

came my alma mater, UNLV, and received an honorary degree from Community College of Southern Nevada.

Elected in 1976 to the Clark County Commission, he served four remarkable terms. During his tenure, he served as chairman of that body, as well as chairman of the Clark County Sanitation District and the Clark County Liquor and Gaming License board.

Manny was also on the governing boards of the University Medical Center, Las Vegas Valley Water District and on the Fiscal Affairs Board of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

Prior to his election as a county commissioner, Manny served as administrator of the State of Nevada Taxicab Authority. His background included employment with the Clark County District Attorney's office and the Clark County public defender's office.

Manny began his service on the Las Vegas convention and Visitors Authority board of directors in 1983 and would go on to lead that agency at a time of the most rapid growth for southern Nevada, the Las Vegas strip and for our tourism industry.

By 1991, Manny had earned the title of president of the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority, the largest convention and visitors organization in the United States. That year, southern Nevada welcomed more than 21 million visitors. By the time of his retirement, that number had grown to 37 million visitors annually.

Travel Agent Magazine named Manny the United States Person of the Year for 1999, calling him "one of the most astute marketers in the tourism industry."

During his tenure as president of the convention authority, the organization came to be regarded as the travel industry's leading destination marketing organization.

Manny was a participant in the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism, and in 2003, the United States Department of Commerce appointed him to the then-newly created U.S. Travel and Tourism Promotion Advisory Board. His role on the board included representing Las Vegas and the United States travel and tourism industry.

Manny, and perhaps this is the most important thing, he is survived by a wife, Joanna, who was his beloved helpmate and friend for 45 years; daughter Cynthia Cortez Musgrove; and Catherine Cortez Masto; a sister, Patricia Snider; and two grandchildren, Andrew and Christina, all of Las Vegas.

There will never be another Manny Cortez, but every time I return home to Las Vegas, his legacy will be on display for the entire world to see and admire.

On a very, very personal note, there is not anybody that was more important to the travel and tourism industry in Las Vegas Nevada than Manny Cortez. He was a dear friend and a mentor to many, many of us who are now serving in public office and have made a

contribution to Las Vegas. His untimely death was a surprise to all of us. We will mourn him, we miss him and we love him.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House once again and the 30-Something Working Group, as you know and the Members know, we come to the floor day after day to share with the Members what we are doing right and what we are doing wrong.

So many times we focus on this side of the aisle on the plans that we have here on the Democratic side of the aisle in helping Americans to continue to prosper, need it be they are in small business or they wake up and go to work every day, educating our children, making sure that we have a healthy and prosperous and safe America.

Before I get started, I know Mr. RYAN will be joining me momentarily, Mr. Speaker. I just want to share with the Members a few plans that we have on this side of the aisle that we would like to implement. The only thing that is stopping us from bringing these plans to the floor and implementing action, well, we are moving in the right direction with great force, is the fact that we are not the majority here, Mr. Speaker, to be able to bring these issues to the floor.

As you know, in the past, I have talked about energy. I encourage Members to go to housedemocrats.gov to pick up a copy of our energy agenda, talking about alternative fuel, talking about bringing about flex vehicles in the industry to be able to allow more Americans to purchase vehicles that are flex vehicles that they can use E-85 and gasoline.

Real security plan, it is there dealing with homeland security. We have already said on this side of the aisle if we are in the majority that we would implement all of the 9/11 recommendations to make America safer. This is a bipartisan commission, as the Members know, that was appointed, and this House was part of it, and they did outstanding work. Those recommendations have still not been fully implemented to protect America.

We have our initiative that we have been trying to promote for the last 3 to 4 months in a very forceful way, which is allowing working Americans to be able to earn more money. It has been 9 years, Mr. Speaker, since the American people have received an increase as it relates to the minimum wage. It is very, very unfortunate that we have Americans that are working for \$5.15 an hour. The minimum wage has been the same since 1997, which is now approaching 10 years.

As you know, many Americans have suffered under the low minimum wage that we have now, that is throughout for individuals that are working every day, and I have a few facts here.

Of the last 50-years, I mean, this is the lowest it has been in the last 50 years. Also, 6.6 million Americans will benefit from an increase in the minimum wage, and something that I must add, the Republican leadership has said that they vow not to raise the minimum wage again this year or next year. So I think that is something that the American people need to pay very close attention to.

Three-quarters of the minimum wage workers are adults that are over the age of 20, many of whom are responsible for over half of the family's income. One day of work, it takes an entire day's wage for an earner to buy a tank of gas.

Also, studies have shown, Mr. Speaker, that zero jobs have been lost when the minimum wage has been increased.

Eighty-six percent of Americans do support an increase in the minimum wage. Twenty-one States have moved in the direction of increasing the minimum wage. I do not know what is going on here with the Republican majority in not moving in that direction to allow more American people to have money in their pocket to be able to provide for their families.

We have talked many times on this floor in the 30-Something Working Group about the new weight that has been placed on the heads of the American people as they start to send their young people to college.

□ 1730

Just yesterday we had a town hall meeting downstairs in this building, in HC5 here in the Capitol Building, with some young people who are third-party validators with the student loans they have out now, Mr. Speaker. And this is very serious, because now people are starting to prepare their young people to go off to college in the month of August and late July, many of whom are now having to take out these student loans at a very high interest rate. They are going to end up paying almost \$100 more a month in interest to pay for their college, and I think that is something we need to pay very close attention to.

It is very unfortunate that on the majority side, Mr. Speaker, on the Republican side, all due respect to all the innovation that one tries to come up with on the other side of the aisle, it is costing the American people more, and it is putting our young people in debt in this country even before they can grab their college degree and earn a living. They are already, on average, somewhere around \$25,000 or \$30,000 in debt when they step across the stage. That is very, very unfortunate.

We cut student aid here. We increase student loan rates here. The States in turn have to cut, and the cost of college is increased. It increases on these

individuals. It is an increase on these individuals.

I think it is also important, Mr. Speaker, for us to talk about the fact that we have the will and the desire on this side of the aisle to move America in the right direction. I talked about this last week, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is very, very important to bring this up here again today; that we are willing to move this country in the right direction, in a new direction, making sure that Americans have more opportunities.

I think it is important for us to point out the fact that on this side of the aisle we have committed again to raising the minimum wage. We have committed to helping this country become energy independent, investing in the Midwest versus the Middle East within 10 years. We have also committed on this side of the aisle, I mentioned it earlier, to implementing all of the 9/11 recommendations.

But one of our major commitments on this side, Mr. Speaker, and also to the American people, is that we have said that we are willing to bring this budget back into balance within a reasonable time; not that we are going to cut the deficit in half, or we are going to balance the budget, but we are going to be able to bring us out of this deficit spending that the Republican majority has led us into with record deficits as far as the eye can see.

We have the resume. On our resume we have the accomplishment of being able to do that. We have accomplished that before in the past, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is something that one needs to pay very close attention to.

When we say a commitment to making sure our fiscal house is in order, it is not a slogan. It is not something that someone says, well, the polls say you need to say you are going to bring spending under control. We have actually attempted to do that.

You have seen this chart before. We can't talk about it enough, because the facts are in. Regardless of the floor speeches that may go on on the Republican side of the aisle, I think it is important for us to outline the fact that we have put our legislation where our mouths are.

We have said that we want to see this House say that if you are going to spend, then spend in a way that almost every American family has to spend. If you are going to buy something, you have to know how you are going to pay for it. You can't put everything on a credit card. And what is unfortunate is that we have allowed other countries to be a part of our country financially not because the American people have made a bad decision, but it is because the majority and the White House have made some bad decisions.

Here I have, Mr. Speaker, a PAYGO rule that on this side we have adopted; that we are willing to pay as we go. If you are going to buy it, you have to show how you are going to pay for it. It is not that you spend or you buy and

then you borrow. JOHN SPRATT, who is the ranking member on the Budget Committee, on the 2006 budget resolution, and this is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this is not something the 30-something Working Group put together, this is rollcall vote 87, March 17 of 2005. Republicans voted 228 against this pay-as-you-go amendment that we put forward.

Again, Mr. SPRATT and the ranking member's substitute amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 393, this is also rollcall vote number 91, March 25, 2004, 224 Republicans voting against pay-as-you-go on a rule we tried to put in place.

When I say try, Mr. Speaker, that is all we can do at this particular point because until Democrats are in the majority, we are not going to be able to put this country into the fiscal position it should be in.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, and I do say once again, I pull my chart out. This is almost my exhibit A here. Third-party validator. And the source that has given us this information happens to be the U.S. Department of the Treasury. Here we show that 42 Presidents over 224 years were only able to borrow from foreign nations, and this is money that the United States has borrowed from foreign nations in 224 years and 42 Presidents, \$1.01 trillion. Through World War I, World War II, the Great Depression, a number of other conflicts, slowdowns in the economy, and other issues that have faced this country, 42 Presidents have only borrowed \$1.01 trillion.

In 4 years, 4 years with President Bush, \$1.05 trillion with the Republican Congress. Just in 4 years, Mr. Speaker. If someone came to me and said, KENDRICK, you have to throw all the charts out but one, if you just wanted one chart, this would be the one that I would pick, Mr. Speaker, because I think it reveals what has happened here in this House, how it has been so easy for the Republican majority to put runaway spending on a credit card and allowed foreign countries to be able to own a part of the American apple pie.

What is so very, very unfortunate here, as all of this borrowing has taken place, you would think that student loans would have a lower interest rate, you would think that alternative fuels would have an opportunity to be a part of the marketplace, and that we would be moving towards more cleaner-burning fuel. You would think that we would have a world-class health care system, and that companies as big as General Motors and as small as a mom-and-pop store that has five or six employees in it would be able to provide health care for their employees, and you would also think, Mr. Speaker, that a number of States would not be suing the Federal Government because of the underfunding of the Leave No Child Behind with all of the money that has been borrowed from foreign nations.

But what has happened is that the superwealthy in this country have gotten the biggest tax cut in the history of the Republic. What has also happened is that Republicans have been allowed to spend in record-breaking, I mean, just off the charts. For Republicans to come down here and blame Democrats for spending—I mean, really, I know it is kind of hard for them to keep eye contact with someone like me and those of us in the 30-something Group who knows better, who know what the facts show, that \$1.05 trillion has been borrowed from foreign countries. They are weakening our country as they start to move and allow these other countries to be able to own so much of the American apple pie.

And I will close with this before I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who came in before Mr. RYAN. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, for us to look at it from this standpoint; that if you borrow money from someone, the relationship has changed. I heard someone from the White House say this morning on the Today Show we are the last standing superpower. Okay, well, you must be talking about militarily, because financially we are getting weaker every day under this administration's policy and the rubber-stamping of this Republican Congress.

I think it is important that everyone understands that we have borrowed money from countries that we have never borrowed money from before in a record-breaking way. The Republican majority has done so without our help, but because they are in the majority, that has happened, and now they are looking at us under a different light.

We still have budgets that are being passed here on this floor that is going to even make the American people more indebted to foreign nations, some that we have questions of their links to possible terrorism and other questionable measures.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My good friend Mr. MEEK really illustrates the point that we have been trying to drive home for all the time that I have been here now, and for several years before my arrival with the beginnings of the 30-something Working Group, and that is that with the illustration that you just had up there, that literally we have racked up as much debt under this President than all the Presidents combined, all 42 before this President.

That really is illustrative of the point we have been making; that America is truly going in the wrong direction, and that in order to right the ship, to start us on the path that Americans want us to be going down, we need to make sure that we elect Democrats in the fall that will no longer support the rubber-stamping that goes on in this institution on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. MEEK, I think what we try to do during our 30-something hour is show

people what some of these more macroconcepts mean in terms of their daily lives. The economy, which the Republicans talk about so often, and actually, I guess, what it is, Mr. RYAN, is that they think that if they say it enough times, it will become true.

I have heard so many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, oh, the economy is great, the President said it, it is gangbusters, we are in the best shape we could possibly be in. Well, how is that possible if you have health care, gas, housing, and college costs that are all skyrocketing through the roof? I mean, the median family income has dropped every year of the Bush administration. The typical family is paying \$1,200 more a year for health insurance, college tuition has gone up about 40 percent in real terms, gas prices have doubled to nearly \$3 a gallon, housing is the least affordable it has been in 14 years, and real wages have been flat since 2001. And we have a chart that illustrates that graphically, but that is the economy that our constituents are living in.

Now, maybe our Republican colleagues are living in some kind of alternative bizarro world. Is there an alternative universe that I am not aware of that perhaps some of them are living? Because this is what reality is: College tuition, up 40 percent under the Bush administration; gas prices up 47 percent; health care costs up 55 percent; and median household income down by 4 percent.

That is good? I don't know. I bet if we looked up "good" in the dictionary it wouldn't reflect any of this reality. Just have a hunch that Webster wouldn't define "good" this way. It wouldn't look like that.

So I want, and I know we all want, to move this country in a new direction, and we have an agenda that would do that; that would deal with the health care crisis that we are in with 46 million Americans without health insurance, people who have to go to the emergency room for their primary health care. We would make sure that we increase the minimum wage, which hasn't been done since 1997. I mean, that is just unbelievable.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just read today in a paper from American Progress, Scott Lilly, former staff member here, who wrote on the minimum wage, and I think he said in there that the minimum wage has the lowest value since the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Fifty years.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So it is unbelievable to think exactly where we are and the lack of leadership that we have here.

On that one poster you just had up, President Bush said the economy is benefiting all Americans. I find that interesting. I had some steelworkers in my office just today from all over Ohio, and they certainly don't think that the current economy is benefiting all Americans, that is for sure.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We are going to take up the estate tax tomorrow, and as much of a deal as our Republican colleagues have made out of this, it benefits about 5,000 people in the country. I mean, 5,000 people. And they are making this such a high priority. It is going to cost over \$200 billion, and this is what they think is a priority, as opposed to dealing with health care, gas prices, college costs, and housing costs.

□ 1745

Yet another example is when they passed their tax reconciliation bill, their tax cut bill earlier this year. Just to give people an idea of what kind of benefit we truly doled out to most folks, if you made between \$10,000 and \$20,000, you would get enough back from the tax cut bill we passed earlier this year, enough back to buy a Slurpee.

There are a whole lot of things that are a priority in my life and the lives of my constituents that I want to make sure that I can buy, my constituents want to be able to buy, and a Slurpee is not really mentioned in the letters written to me in my office.

Now let's go down to the people making between \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year. That is a working family. They would get back enough to buy a gallon of gas. I think that probably most people would think if we are going to pass a tax cut measure, if we are going to really provide revenue and give folks back their hard earned tax dollars, it should be more than the value of a gallon of gas.

But if you are fortunate enough to make more than \$1 million, you get back the equivalent of a Hummer. Now that is something that most people could probably write home about. But how many people in America make more than \$1 million.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And in the context of this, where do we get the money to give the millionaire to get the Hummer, we don't have it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And tomorrow we are going to do more.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are borrowing this money. That is the kicker. As Mr. MEEK pointed out earlier in the hour, where we are getting the money from to borrow to give to the people who make more than a million a year, and now we have to pay interest on that money. This is what we pay in interest on the debt, just the red, \$230-some billion compared to what we spend on education, homeland security and veterans.

So a disproportionate amount of our budget dollars go just to pay interest on the debt. We get no value from that. We are just giving the Chinese, the Japanese, the OPEC countries, our money that they will continue to try to invest and take jobs away from us. We do need to go in another direction.

I think this goes right to the heart. There are two belief systems here. There is the Republican belief system

that says cut taxes for millionaires, give corporate welfare to the oil and health care industries, okay. That is their belief system. Let's make sure that the pharmaceutical industry has no ability or we don't have any ability to negotiate down the prices with them. That is their belief system.

But the Democratic belief system is that everybody needs to pay their fair share and make some sacrifice. Why is it just the middle class, the poor and the small business owner making all the sacrifice while the wealthiest people get their tax break.

Our belief system is that they need to pay their fair share, those making more than a million a year because they are benefiting from the largess of the United States of America, and we need to take that money and invest it into research and development, stem cell research, 21st century technologies, broadband for every household, making sure that our schools are functioning, No Child Left Behind is funded, and that we reduce the amount of interest that you have to pay on a college loan.

Mr. Speaker, what the Republicans are doing with college loans is ridiculous.

Now the Democrats want to cut student loan interest rates in half for both parents and students. The Republicans want to increase it and give tax breaks to millionaires. The Democrats are for raising the minimum wage. The Republicans will not bring a bill to the floor that actually passed out of committee that raises minimum wage.

The Republicans are for giving corporate welfare to the oil industry. The Republican Congress put that money in, \$16 billion went to energy companies, corporate welfare at this time of great profits.

All of these things, it is about beliefs and we have our share of beliefs, they have theirs, and the American people are going to choose.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would just like to go back to energy prices and gas prices. Just to zero in on one of the things that is the most galling about the direction that the Republican Congress has taken us in, gas prices are up.

I am one of those minivan moms. I have little kids and when I go home, I am going to dance class and soccer games and shuttling them all over my district. It is a lot of driving. With three kids, you have to have a large enough vehicle to fit the car seats and the stuff and the athletic equipment and the dance bags, and so minivans are an essential piece of life when you are a mom or dad with little kids. It costs like \$55 to fill up the gas tank of a minivan.

I have reached the conclusion that the only explanation for the continued direction that our Republican colleagues have taken us in when it comes to gas prices and refusing to deal with the energy crisis and refusing to adequately fund, if fund at all, alternative

energy sources is because they obviously haven't filled their own tanks of gas since gas pumps looked like this.

This is a replica of a gas pump from the 1950s or thereabouts. I truly believe they must not pump their own gas, or the last time they did, pumps looked like this or they would be feeling the pain. You cannot stand there for as long as you stand there for squeezing the pump and watching the tally click by, \$10, \$20, \$30, \$40, \$50. You can't do that, even if you can afford it, without it being somewhat painful.

Think about it, think about the mom or dad who is just barely making ends meet. They are barely making ends meet before gas went over \$3 a gallon. When is enough enough? Where is the outrage? Where is the legislation? Where is the oversight? Why aren't they calling the CEOs of the oil companies and asking is it possible that they are not in collusion, that they are not conspiring to set prices the same. It is mind boggling. I don't understand why they don't care. That is clearly the message that is sent here.

What we would do, we would make sure that we could, within 10 years, be independent of foreign oil by pursuing alternative energy research like ethanol. Brazil has done it. This is our innovation agenda. For anyone on the other side of the aisle who wants to continue to perpetuate the myth that Democrats have no agenda, here is a big piece of it in several colors, not just black and white.

This innovation agenda includes a number of things, not the least of which is our ability to truly end our addiction to foreign oil which the President talked about in his State of the Union, and only talked about and did nothing to change it. Our innovation agenda would help us get there. It would also make sure that we give people universal access to broadband in 5 years. It also does a number of other things to take us in a new direction.

I know I have focused specifically in on one part of the problem, but because that is something that people deal with every single day or every couple of days when their gas light goes on and their tank runs empty, and I know you both agree with me that it is something that we need to put the magnifying glass on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Knowing a lot of members on the other side of the aisle, I am not sure that they don't care, but clearly it is weak, passive leadership. We need strong leadership. We need not only a new direction, but strong, bold ideas that are going to take us forward. This whole idea, the whole political realm is about ideas.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are dinosaurs. They are still working in the old oil days and those countries that are going to be on the cutting edge are going to be into these alternative energy sources. But you can't have weak, passive leadership that fails to step up to bat when the country needs them.

One gentleman who was in my office said we need leadership. We need you to help us. We are losing control. We feel less and less like we are in control. And the things that the Democrats want to implement are to make sure that people have control of their own lives to the extent that they can, and that is education, that is being healthy, that is making sure that there is opportunity through these investments and research and development that we want to do. We want to make sure that these ideas are getting out there through strong, bold leadership that is going to move the country forward. I know Mr. MEEK supports that. I have had conversations with him about that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to be as calm as possible.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You are calm today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I am pleased because the Miami Heat has taken care of business in four games straight. There is going to be a great parade in Miami celebrating the Miami Heat's achievement of achieving the NBA championship, and that team consists of a lot of young guys and older guys that have really worked hard.

I would just like to say this is the first time I have given the Dallas Mavericks any charitable words since I have been here on the floor and in this building, that they played hard. It was a great series and I appreciate the folks that are in Dallas, Texas, for their sportsmanship and the fans. But in Miami, we are very, very excited about it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And that is not what he was saying last night about Dallas when we were watching the game.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me just say this, I am saying that this whole thing is about sportsmanship and be able to enjoy and have a good time. It is a great lesson for young people about mental mistakes that people can make.

Life is like basketball, things happen and you have to adjust to those things. Folks were thinking I was going to talk for 30 minutes about the Miami Heat, but I don't want to waste the House time dealing with that, and they will be recognized later on. So we will move on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just wore the colors.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ wore the colors. I am not wearing the beads that I was wearing. We were down 0-2. I put the beads on and the Heat just went four games all the way.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thought we were going to move on.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me say, Mr. RYAN, you were talking about leadership and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was talking about leadership. I think it is important when we look at leadership, that is not just in the White House. That is here in the U.S. House of Representatives, and it is very, very

important that we have a body of Members here that have the will and the desire to lead.

As you all were talking, I was pulling out a couple of examples to show you a lack of leadership. Remember the Wizard of Oz when they said let it be green and let it be red and let it be blue, and that is fine for a movie; but that is not fine for the United States of America as it relates to policy in any area.

Let's start off at the top of the week when the White House said let's talk about the great things that are happening in Iraq or not happening in Iraq. It seems to be just the opposite at the end of the week of what is not happening in Iraq and what is happening in Iraq.

But the bigger question is what is happening here in this House. We spent all kind of time running back and forth into last week, Members coming down to the floor making speeches, getting all puffy in the chest and talking and carrying on about who loves the troops and who doesn't love the troops.

□ 1800

No, I love them more than you do. I have a tattoo, you know, that said I love the troops.

It is not all about how you say it. It's what you do. And the bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, nothing came out of the resolution that was passed. I mean, it is not like the resolution was passed and all of a sudden some great policy measure, some sort of major dollars going into veteran affairs or some direction to the Iraqi Government of how we really, where we really stand as it relates to it and relates to the war in Iraq. And I think it is important that, some of the things that I wrote down, Mr. Speaker is, following the Bush administration, and its rubber-stamp Congress has allowed the Bush administration to continue to carry out poor planning as it relates to the war in Iraq. Also, no plan for success. It is okay not to have a plan. Because we are in the majority, we are going to write a resolution that we are not going to even allow a Democrat to even put a period or a comma in, and because we are in the majority, we are going to endorse it, no oversight whatsoever from the U.S. House of Representatives. No oversight, Mr. Speaker. No accountability, no investigations of what is going on with the taxpayers' money that has been stolen in record numbers, no-bid contracts, \$17 billion for Halliburton alone.

The Democrats, what do we want? We want accountability. We want to make sure that 2006 is a significant year as it relates to transition and plan for Iraq. We want to make sure that the Iraqi people know that they are going to have to take responsibility for their government more sooner than later. And as long as we start saying we are going to stay as long as we are going to stay, they are going to keep saying it is going to take us as long as it is going to take us. It is in the U.S. tax-

payers' pocket, and the American troops that are there will continue to pay the price with life, limb and blood and time away from their families as long as the Republican rubber-stamp Congress continues to rubber-stamp whatever the White House has said.

Another point I wanted to make here. Some troops are on their fourth deployment. What does that mean if you are a soldier? That means you are going back for the fourth time. And it may be 12, 15 months. If you are a marine, many of the marines are definitely on their fourth deployment. A little shorter time, tougher duty, and it goes on and on and on.

Recruiting standards have been loosened. The National Guard units have just 34 percent of the required equipment that they need once they go back into the theater. And that is something that we have to pay very close attention to.

And the last point here as it relates to the no plan and the continue to throw the rock and hide your hand philosophy that this Republican Congress has is the fact that veterans' copayments are going up as it relates to prescription drug care. No plan for veterans when they come back with all of the issues that they are going to come back with to their families. We deserve to give them the attention that they need, and there is no plan for that.

So to come and do the John Wayne, if I could use his name as a tough guy, and to say that, oh, we are going to do this, and using slogans about how we need to, people, anyone that talks about anything about Iraq outside of I am with the President, they are not really with the American people.

Well, let me tell you something. I want a news flash to the members of the Republican side of the aisle. The American people are not feeling your rhetoric. And I think we will know in November about where we are because the American people are looking, Mr. RYAN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for some leadership.

I think on the Republican side of the aisle, some folks need to go see the wizard, get some courage and some leadership, and to be able to say we are willing to work in a bipartisan way. I say this with great confidence because a lot of my Republican colleagues know it, and a lot of them tell me. You know, they say, KENDRICK, you know, you 30-somethings, you come kind of hard sometimes, but you know something, I can't get upset with you because it is true. Third-party validators know that it is true.

I am sick and tired of seeing these parents get on the Today Show in the morning, Mr. Speaker, and trying to bring some sort of understanding in their own mind of why we are there without a plan, and why are we sacrificing our troops on the front line when it is now taking, going on 3, 4 years to train Iraqi troops, when we have had individuals that were in sophomores in high school that have been trained and

sent into theater and now on their second deployment. It is just kind of hard to explain that for Mr. RYAN and I that are on the Armed Services Committee. It is just hard to understand that, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

So this game of saying that we are going to stay as long as we have to stay, don't ask any questions, I think those days are over. I think the American discourse is going to take over what this House has not done, and I know that they are going to speak in a very positive way towards the party that has the plan.

Now, we have plans and ideas on the table here in the House and in the Senate. But guess what? We are at least talking about a plan, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We are just not saying, oh, excuse me. What did they say at the White House? Oh, they want to continue a war without a plan? Okay. That is fine. We will just rubber-stamp that. And what else can we do for the President? So shall it be written, so shall it be done, at the price of the American taxpayer and the price of some families as it relates to never seeing their father or mother again.

So I think it is something that is very serious. I am making fun of the fact that there is a rubber-stamp Congress here, but I have to say, ladies and gentlemen, that it is a reality. It is a reality. No questions asked. Rubber stamp. And I hope that the American people pay very close attention to it.

So I am glad that the Democratic Caucus has put their foot down and have said that enough is enough. You won't hear me talk about why can't we work in a bipartisan way, because we have been saying it since I have been here going on now 4 years, Mr. Speaker. So the will and the desire is not on the Republican side to even work with the Democrats. So now you have to move in the campaign that we have now and moving this country in a new direction, and that new direction is going to be inclusion. We are going to include Republicans in a bipartisan way, and moving this country and all the things that we talked about, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ talked about, Mr. RYAN is talking about, and when folks can go on housedemocrats.gov and find our plan in moving this country in a new direction. We have the will and the desire, and we will definitely do it.

With that I would like to yield to Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You brought up the Republican lack of plan or planning or any agenda really. But I think we are living, as we said the last time we were here, we are living in the midst of an implemented neoconservative Republican agenda. Here it is. We are living in it right now.

You want to know what the Republicans will do? Go to the gas pump. Look at your health care bills. Look at your college tuition. Just look. Look at Iraq. Look at Afghanistan. This is the neoconservative agenda as ordered. This is exactly what they wanted to do.

They have the House, they have the Senate, they have the White House, and here it is. Look no more.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You know, you are just absolutely right, because what we are talking about is the direction that we would take this country in if we were given an opportunity, that we would expand access to health care and make sure the 46 million people who don't have it now, that far more, if not all of them, would have it; that we would truly invest in exploring alternative energy resources so that oil was not our only option; that we would make sure, and we committed.

We had a town hall meeting with 30-somethings with Leader PELOSI and Ranking Member MILLER, had a town hall meeting just the other day where we talked about that on the first day that we take the majority back in this House of Representatives and Leader PELOSI becomes Speaker PELOSI, we would halve the interest rate on federally subsidized loans, literally saving potential college kids thousands and thousands of dollars.

But you know what? The attitude of the administration and the Republican leadership, Mr. MEEK, you said you are sick and tired. I think people are sick and tired of being sick and tired. And I think that Americans have reached that point.

And it never ceases to amaze me what their leaders, what the Republican leaders actually say. I mean, that they say out loud; never mind the thoughts they harbor, because you know we will obviously never, we can only guess what those are. But what they say is unbelievable.

A few days ago we sadly marked the death, we were talking about the war in Iraq and how they have no plan; that this is an interminable war that has no end in sight, no plan, no ability to phase ourselves out. The other day we marked the death of the 2,500th soldier, American soldier. And White House spokesman Tony Snow said this about that milestone. He said, "It is a number, and every time there is one of these 500 benchmarks, people want something."

Yeah. They want no more kids to die. They want no more of our American men and women to die needlessly without any possibility in the near future of knowing that they are coming home.

A number? Sure. There are plenty of numbers that we could throw out there, the numbers that people care about beyond just 2,500 of our soldiers being lost. For example, 18,490 American troops were wounded in Iraq. And we have third-party validation for all of these. About 40,000 Iraqis have been killed, beyond the American troops. \$8.8 billion. Here are some more numbers: \$8.8 billion is the amount of Iraqi reconstruction funds the military has failed to account for, according to the Department of Defense's inspector general; 68 journalists killed in Iraq; 2.2 million Active Duty soldiers and veterans at risk of identity theft. Actually

that is more. Now with the theft of the computer it is 26.5 million; 382 days since Vice President CHENEY claimed the insurgency was in its last throes. Ask the parents of the two American soldiers that were kidnapped and killed by insurgents the other day if they think that the insurgency is in its last throes; 1,140 days since President Bush declared mission accomplished in Iraq; 37 million people living in poverty in the United States; 13 million children living in poverty in the United States; \$8,375,365,051,008.48. That is the amount of the deficit, yet tomorrow we are going to consider an estate tax that benefits 5,000 people; 45.8 million Americans without health insurance, just to be exact; \$16,000, which is the median debt of graduates of public colleges; \$20,000 is the median debt of graduates of private colleges, yet after July 1, the interest rates for a college loan will be hiked up significantly, thanks to the Republicans' leadership here; \$36 billion Exxon/Mobil's profits last year, more than any other corporation in history. Those are the numbers that the Republicans should find important.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we spend so much time talking about the budget, and those are great numbers that you have shared here. And I see Ranking Member SPRATT here on the floor, JOHN SPRATT, who has done such an outstanding job on the budget. And as you know, I always hold this chart up about the foreign-owned debt and where we are going and what is being spent.

Mr. RYAN spoke to how we are paying more on the debt than we are paying on education, veteran affairs and a couple of other areas, too, homeland security. And I saw Mr. SPRATT, and I just couldn't resist, sir. I know that you were here to put in a RECORD statement, but can you just share, just kind of bring into focus what has happened here and what will continue to happen, if the Republican Congress continue to have their way?

Mr. SPRATT. There are lots of ways to present it, and you have got some ingenious devices there on the table. I found this back-of-the-envelope summary of how much we have increased the debt ceiling of the United States, the legal limit to which this government can borrow, which is set by statute, over the years that George Bush has been President of the United States.

When the Bush administration first came to the Congress back in 2001, with their proposal to do 1 trillion, 800 billion in tax cuts over a 10-year period of time, they told us we could do these tax cuts and still we won't be back here to ask for an increase in the debt ceiling, the legal lending borrowing limit, until 2008.

The next year, June 2002, hat in hand, they were back here at the Congress saying we missed it. We overestimated the surplus. The tax cuts have taken effect. We need a \$450 billion increase

in the debt ceiling of the United States.

□ 1815

That was June of 2002. Within a year, May, 2003, they were back, and they were asking this time for a phenomenal sum of money, a \$984 billion increase in the debt ceiling of the United States.

If you go back to 1981, just before I first came to Congress, when Mr. Reagan became President of the United States, the entire debt of the United States was less than \$984 billion. In 1 year, they needed to raise the debt ceiling by that amount to accommodate the budgets of the Bush administration. Well, that was May of 2003.

Fourteen months later, November 2004, there was another \$800 billion increase. And when we passed the supplemental for the budget this year, the supplemental spending bill, there was slipped into it a provision increasing the debt ceiling by \$781 billion. And still pending there is another increase. It is hard to believe. Back of the envelope sums it up better than any possible way I could. When they passed the budget resolution in the House this year, it included an additional increase of \$653 billion. If you add all of those debt ceiling increases together, you will find that the total amount of debt ceiling increase in the Bush administration comes to \$3.7 trillion. \$3.7 trillion, that is how much we have had to raise the debt ceiling, the legal borrowing rate of this government, in order to make room for the deficits caused by the Bush administration's budget.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. SPRATT, I am so glad that you are here because here I hold a letter that former Secretary Snow wrote you about the emergency situation we are in of raising the debt ceiling.

Again, Mr. Speaker, third-party validators. U.S. Secretary Snow, who is like the accountant, or used to be the accountant, of the United States of America, literally begging you, wrote you a letter and said, We have to raise this thing or I am going to have to shut down normal government operations.

Mr. SPRATT. That letter was in February.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That letter was in February. And then there is another one, Mr. Speaker, on March 6 that he wrote, again saying that we have to raise the debt ceiling.

So we have the Bush administration appointees. I use these rubber stamps here, Mr. SPRATT, as the rubber stamp Congress that we put here. So this wasn't a part of the letter, but we highlight here the begging, saying that they will not be able to pay into the G fund and other investments that they have to pay into to be able to assist. It is saying they are going to have to suspend investing in the Federal employees retirement fund.

So, Mr. SPRATT, I just wanted to bring that out, a third-party validator's saying that they have to

raise the debt ceiling. But we spend a lot of time here, sir, as you know, in the 30-Something Working Group because we are working with the fact that young Americans and the future generations, what this is going to mean and what it is meaning right now to American families. And we also highlight the two amendments. This is almost like having the man that has made it happen here on our side of the aisle trying to move into a pay-as-you-go to stop exactly what you are pointing out there, sir.

Mr. SPRATT. Exactly. That simple rule worked better than any budget resolution, any budget rule we enacted during the 1980s and during the 1990s. I was here, involved in the process. I can stand witness to it. PAYGO worked.

But don't take my word for it. Last year, while he was still chairman of the Fed, Alan Greenspan testified before our committee three times, and on each occasion we asked him, What is your assessment of the budget process rules we adopted in the 1990s and let expire in 2002? He said, I was a cynic then. I thought it was a diversionary tactic. But I have to acknowledge that those budget process rules had an enormous impact on the success we achieved, moving the budget from \$290 billion in deficits when George Bush left office in 1992 to \$236 billion in surplus in the year 2000. PAYGO, he said, works. And he recommended that it be renewed, extended in its old form, affecting both tax cuts and entitlement increases. That was Alan Greenspan saying it accounted for a lot of the success of the budget discipline we displayed in the 1990s.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mr. SPRATT.

I yield now to Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the congressman. I have a question. I was in my office and I got a notice across my desk that perhaps tomorrow we may be debating the estate tax for millionaires.

And my question is that we can't get the minimum wage up that affects close to 7 million Americans that are working every day that can't make ends meet, but yet we are talking about an estate tax that is going to only affect about 6,700, the top 1 percent in the entire country. But my question is how are we going to pay for it? We are in a war that we are paying \$450 billion for, and we are spending about \$600 billion a month. So how are we going to pay for this?

Mr. SPRATT. The bottom line is we charge the tab to our children. We have a deficit today. This fiscal year the deficit will probably be somewhere between 300 and \$350 billion. If we adopt additional tax cuts, they will go straight to the bottom line and only make the deficit larger.

Now, the tax cuts envisioned by this estate tax extension will come in the outer years because we are still in-

creasing the exemptions and lowering the rate applicable to decedents' estates right now under old law. This will mean that in the first 10 years that this estate tax provision is fully implemented, the first 10 years when it is fully effective, the cost will be somewhere between 700 and \$800 billion in revenues lost or foregone. Seven to \$800 billion during that period of time. And that will be a period of time when the baby boomers will be beginning to retire in big numbers and starting to draw Social Security and Medicare, and we all know both of those programs are going to be strained under the load of the baby boomers' retirement.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Congressman, how long have you been here in Congress? Over what, 30 years? How long have you been a Member of Congress?

Mr. SPRATT. I have been here for 23 years.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Twenty-three years. And in that time period I know you have seen always checks and balances, whether it is the House, the Senate, or the administration. The problem that we are experiencing now is that we have every branch of government controlled by Republicans, whether it is the House, the Senate, or the administration. And so therefore there is no restraint. That is why 77 percent of the American people say that Congress is out of step with them.

Mr. SPRATT. No question about it. That is one of the problems you have with the line item veto. It says we need to let the President get involved even more. I voted for an expedited rescission, a line item veto before, here on this House floor. But really I think that Congress itself should turn to its own problems and start addressing those as opposed to going outside the Congress for solutions. We know what the problem is. We do not have a budget resolution this year adopted by both Houses. One of the things we learned in the 1980s and again in the 1990s was that you need a multi-year plan. Typically a 5-year plan. Not just a 1-year budget but a 5-year budget so you can see the implications on the tax side and on the spending side of what everything you are doing does to the bottom line. And we do not have a 5-year budget at this point in time. And the budget process rules like the PAYGO rule and the discretionary spending caps that we adopted in the 1990s no longer apply. The law elapsed. The Republicans allowed it to elapse and did not renew it. And consequently we do not have those disciplines that we had in the 1980s and 1990s that finally brought the deficit to heal and, furthermore, in the year 2000, put it in surplus to the tune of \$236 billion. The last full fiscal year of the Clinton administration, that is where it was, \$236 billion in the black.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I want to thank the leadership that we

have here that come and discuss these issues. And it seems that the major problem that we have in this country is that we do not have any checks or balances. The House, the Senate, and the administration are all controlled by Republicans. So if you don't have any checks and balances, we will have zero balance in the bank account.

Mr. SPRATT. As a matter of fact, our Republican colleagues control the House. They have a majority in the Senate, and, of course, they control the White House. So they cannot escape responsibility for these fiscal results.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to join you all this evening.

Rubber Stamp Republicans: There is a very good reason why 77 percent of the American public does not believe that the United States Congress represents their interests. Instead of debating a fair minimum wage bill, tomorrow we will be debating the Repeal of the Estate Tax for millionaires!

Instead of dealing with high gas prices, Republicans want to talk about gay marriage. Instead of providing the services that the veterans need when they return from Iraq, the Republicans want to talk about flag burning.

Just last week, seven House Republicans joined Democrats in supporting an increase in the minimum wage, but yesterday, when the measure came up in the CJS appropriations bill, they suddenly changed their minds, joining the rest of the Republicans in ignoring the needs of seven million hard working minimum wage workers.

So while ignoring the needs of hardworking low-income workers, House Republicans once again will vote to reward those who least need help!

Just as they rewarded Halliburton, they continue to award big oil companies huge tax breaks at the expense of hard working Americans paying over \$3 per gallon!

The White House is collecting our phone records and tapping our phones, yet has no interest in investigating the abuse and fraud by Halliburton in Iraq.

It is high time our country needs a change in direction! We need new energy policies, Iraq policy, higher education policy, health care policy, transportation, national security, and the list goes on and on and on! And this needs to be done in a fiscally sound way, not in a way that puts our children into more debt than they're piled in already.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. SPRATT and Ms. BROWN. We are so glad to have you here with the 30-Something Working Group.

Mr. SPRATT. Does that mean I get to join the 30-Something Working Group?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We will adopt you as a member.

And we would like to remind the Members, Mr. Speaker, that all of the charts and documents that we have talked about tonight are on our Web site, housedemocrats.gov/30something.

THE STRENGTH OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). Under the Speak-

er's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the responsibility and the privilege to speak to you in this House and to represent my constituents here.

I came over here to raise the issue on a number of bits of subject matter. And as I sat and listened, of course, the subject changed a little bit as I listened to the group here on the other side. And I think that it is important to edify Americans as to the difference between Republicans and Democrats. And I am just really grateful that when I was born and I was reared in a family, I began to build a certain attitude about life. And as that attitude unfolded, I was taught from the beginning to fend for yourself. You are going to have to get out there and make something out of yourself in this lifetime because nobody is going to do it for you. Your ship will never come in. Take control of your life. So at an early age, I realized that when I was born, my glass was half full and it was my job to get out of bed, go to work every day, and go ahead and fill that glass up.

I was not raised with an attitude and neither did I gather an attitude that my glass was half empty. I was always grateful that I was born here in America. And when I would ask my parents, what is the best country in the world to come from? They would always answer, The United States of America is the best country in the world. Eat your cold mashed potatoes. There are people starving in China.

That is kind of the composite of the upbringing that I had. But grateful for this Nation, and I would always ask why, what is the difference? And probe into these other countries. And, of course, the people starving in China part was what we talked about then. But country after country in the aftermath of World War II, we were the only surviving industrial nation, and this Nation that had preserved freedom for the world, for the entire globe, and had we not done that, we would not be standing here today speaking in English, for example, Mr. Speaker, but speaking in a free way with free ideas and having this free exchange.

I stand at the same spot on which Tom DeLay gave his last speech here in this Congress. And he made a point that I think is an important one. And that is that, yes, there is partisanship and, yes, we have sharp disagreements. We have those disagreements because we have a Constitution that protects our right to do so. But he made a point that was, you show me a Nation that does not have partisanship and I will show you a tyranny. So when we disagree, we need to be grateful that we can disagree, and we should base that on fundamental philosophical differences and highlight those.

But there is a difference in human nature. Part of human nature is like me that sees our glass half full. Part of

human nature is like the people on the other side of the aisle that see their glass and the glass of their constituents as half empty. And that is all right if you look at it from that perspective. But then you have to take it to the next level. And the next level is those that see their glass half full set about going to work to fill it, and we pull each other up the ladder because we know that as we all go out and work and produce and market and save and invest that that helps everyone, that this economy grows. This is not a zero sum game. It is not a goose that has so many golden eggs in it where we can just simply slaughter the goose and harvest the eggs. It is an economy that needs to have inputs. It needs to have capital investment, both intellectual capital and real dollars in a real way. We need to have entrepreneurs. We need to keep generating new ideas. This organism of our economy, has a lot of components in it, and it needs to be working and churning. And when we go in there and we tap into this organism of our economy and we start to take from it and not put into it, then it slows down the growth of our economy and it grows slowly.

But this was an economy that when Ronald Reagan was sworn in outside this building in 1980, the Dow Jones was below 1,000. I do not remember the exact number, but I know it was below 1,000. Today it is at 11,000. That is a good measure of what has happened with our economy, and that should be something that should tell, Mr. Speaker, the American people that when your glass is half full and you go to work to fill that glass up the rest of the way and you help your brethren up the ladder along the way that the sum total of the size of the pie, which is divided up amongst now 300 million Americans, gets greater and greater and greater, and that means when the pie is bigger, the size of the pieces can be bigger for each individual that is involved. This is not a matter of taking from the rich and giving to the poor. This is a matter which the argument that I am hearing really slows down this economy and that when you tax someone for the labor they do, you punish them for that labor.

Ronald Reagan also said what you tax, you get less of.

□ 1830

So we have a first lien on all productivity in America. The Federal Government has the first lien on all productivity in America. So we tax production. We tax earnings, savings and investment. We tax Social Security, we tax your pension, we tax your capital gains, your income tax, your corporate income tax, your partnership income tax. Also we tax your earnings on investments and your Alternative Minimum Tax. All those things are taxed.

Well, when there is a tax applied to anything, it is a disincentive to

produce. So the first lien on all productivity in America slows down the productivity in America, but it does gather dollars from those wages to run the Federal Government.

Now, if you think your glass is half empty and it is not a growing economy, but simply something, a same size pie every year that gets divided up differently depending on who has the political power, not depending on who produces into this economy, eventually what you are doing is you are killing the goose that lays the golden eggs, harvesting the eggs and thinking somehow there is going to be another goose come along.

Mr. Speaker, it will not. There will not be another goose come along. This is the one we are going to have to nurture. This economy that is growing, the one producing the golden eggs that are popping out here, it is because people have invested capital and taken risks and put in sweat equity and had a vision and made a sacrifice with their time and their dollars, and sometimes from their families, to make their businesses run or to go to their jobs to help their companies operate, or sit in the basement or up in the attic working sometimes working on inventions that become creative inventions that increase and contribute to this dynamic economy that we have.

So much was said about the national debt. My glass is half full and I am going to work to fill it up. Most Americans are doing that. That is why Republicans have control of the House, the Senate and the White House.

Some folks believe their glass is half empty, and if they sit around with their tin cup, then let me tell you, that cup will never be full. You have to take charge of your life.

Now, that doesn't mean that we don't have compassion. In fact, everybody in America has access to high quality health care. We have the highest percentage of personal ownership of their homes ever in the history of the United States, and, I would submit, in the history of the world. That home ownership was at 68 percent the last time I checked. If you go into the poverty regions, you have a higher home ownership there than ever before. This administration has been great for people who are on the lower income side of this, and I have got a proposal I will talk about that will make it even better yet.

But I want to give everybody hope, Mr. Speaker. I want to give them all hope that there is a reason to get out of bed to go to work and make your life better.

In fact, to solve the pathologies in the United States, it is a pretty simple equation, and that is simply this: For people who are going to have children, to get married and stay married, get a job and keep a job. Statistically that solves almost all of society's pathologies.

It is not a complicated equation. We need to encourage people to go to

work. Most do. Out of 300 million people in America, there are 7.5 million on the unemployment rolls. Those numbers have been actually inching down as new jobs have been created.

There is about another 4.3 million that are on welfare, and another 5.3 million that have exhausted their unemployment benefits that are still looking for a job but are not technically listed on the unemployment list.

That as a percentage of America isn't particularly large, but altogether, between the ages of 16 and on up through retirement, there are 77.5 million non-working Americans in this society. We have a large labor force there that we can go to when we need that labor force. But we have made good progress with the unemployment lists also there.

We haven't reached the lowest unemployment. I would point out that when people say we are at full employment at 5 percent unemployment, or 4.7 percent unemployment, I don't accept that number. The lowest unemployment that I can find statistically throughout, at least the last 100 years or so that we have kept records, is 1.2 percent unemployment, and that was during World War II. So I qualify that statement.

But that was when we had all hands on deck. If we really get in trouble, we can be all hands on deck again. We haven't needed to do that. So, we do have a large labor force that is here and we can draw from that.

But as I listened to the Members on the other side of the aisle, the group that has consistently been down here using the word "Republican" as if it were a four letter word, I don't know how to spell it with only four letters, but I know how they say it when it sounds like a four letter word. They talk about the national debt, they talk about a balanced budget and they talk about the balanced budget under Bill Clinton.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, there was a balanced budget under Bill Clinton, but there were budgets that were sent to President Clinton that were vetoed because he sent them back and demanded more spending, over and over again.

This government was shut down by a veto of Bill Clinton, not because he was insisting that we should balance the budget. He was insisting that he wanted more money. That was the issue here back during the Clinton years. I will admit that there was a partisan divide going on during that time, and I will say that the Republicans in this Congress presented those first balanced budgets that we had seen in decades, and they insisted that the budgets be balanced, and that is what happened. It wasn't because Bill Clinton was ponding on his podium asking for balanced budgets. He was demanding more spending.

Now, a decade later, I hear Members of his party come here on the floor it

take credit for the balanced budget during the Clinton years, when, yes, he signed them all right, he did not have a lot of choice, but this Congress, this Republican Congress, made him balance the budget. In fact, they balanced the budget and they required him to sign it.

Then, in the aftermath or in the latter months of the Clinton administration, we had this thing going on called the dot.com bubble. I don't know if we realized it was a dot.com bubble until it burst. But when you think about it, it had to happen. In fact, my instincts were telling me that it was this; that we had technologically, because of great inventions by Americans and the stimulation that we have here and the structure that rewards productivity, invented the technology that allowed us to store and transfer information more effectively, more efficiently and cheaper than ever before.

It was an amazing ride to see that dot.com bubble go up in our stock markets, because the people were investing in these dot.com companies on the anticipation that there would be a financial reward on the other end that would be in proportion to our ability to store and transfer that information more cheaply than ever before.

Well, it didn't work out quite that way, Mr. Speaker, because information has value, but it isn't measured just by the amount of information. It is measured by its commercial value, and information as a commercial value has to allow you to produce a good or service and that deliver that good or service more efficiently than before, otherwise as a business you don't have an interest for paying for that information.

In the case of the Internet would be a good example, it is also marketable that you can get people to pay for their Internet service so that they can have recreational information on the Internet service. So you can use that Internet for business purposes and you will pay for that, and people also pay for it for recreational purposes. That is the only two ways that information has a value in the marketplace. So we overspeculated on our ability to store and transfer information more cheaply and more efficiently than ever before, and that was the dot.com bubble.

Well, the lawsuit on Microsoft I believe was the lance that pierced the dot.com bubble. It would have burst anyway, because it was a growing bubble that was speculation. But when that lawsuit came and the lance of the lawsuit against Microsoft pierced the dot.com bubble, then we saw the stock market begin to contract. In fact, a lot of us will say we were moving into a recession, and I will say we were, and that was at the end of the Clinton administration.

On top of that, we inaugurated President Bush out here on the West Portico. When that happened, he was in the middle of this bursting of the dot.com bubble and the decline in our stock market and our economy.

We hardly got a handle on what was happening there, and along came September 11, the terrible damage to our financial institutions in the heart of New York City at ground zero, the Twin Towers, and, of course, the attacks on the Pentagon and the crash of the plane in Pennsylvania. That was an attack on our financial centers that sent it into a further downward spiral.

So we had two things working against this economy: The formerly balanced budget, running into the dot.com bubble that shut down the revenues here and dramatically reduced our revenues here in the Federal Government, and on the heels of that came the September 11 attack and the impact on our financials in the United States of America was dramatic.

Then on the heels of that we had to create a Homeland Security Department, that spent billions of dollars to protect 300 million Americans, and has done so very effectively. We have not been attacked on our own soil since that time in any effective way. And additionally, we had to appropriate money because we went to war in the global war on terror.

All of those things stacked against this economy, and, do you know, we are growing back out of this thing, because there was vision on the part of President Bush, there was vision on the part of his financial advisers and vision on the part of the leadership in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, that had the fortitude to come to this floor and propose tax cuts that stimulated this economy.

If President Bush had not had the vision and the courage to do that, if this Congress hadn't had the vision and courage to step forward and propose and initiate these tax cuts, the Bush tax cuts, as we know them now, we would have seen a depression, not just a recession, but a depression in this economy, Mr. Speaker, and that would have been the price we would have paid if we would have stuck with, I will say the philosophy that we have heard over here on how we ought to be running a balanced budget.

The people on the other side of the aisle, if they had been in the majority in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, would have proposed tax increases. They would have said, well, first of all, let's not take on these global terrorists. Let's figure out a way that we can curl up into a national fetal position, and perhaps we could have just put enough guards at every school and every bus stop and every theater and every church and maybe even every home and turned America into one great big, huge Israel, and somehow or another cowered away and apologized to the terrorists, and maybe they wouldn't have attacked us again. But they would have. They attacked us in the first place, didn't they?

So under the leadership of the other side of the aisle, there would not have been a proactive tip-of-the-spear effort in Afghanistan, there would not have

been a proactive tip-of-the-spear effort in Iraq. They would have turned the United States into one huge Israel, and that would be a defensive posture with enemies all around, wondering where they are going to come from next.

That is not the way I want to live, Mr. Speaker. I refuse to live that way. I insist that we exercise our rights to live in freedom, and freedom requires risk, it requires sacrifice, and there is danger involved. But it is worth it. It is worth it from the time Patrick Henry articulated it so well, it is worth it from the time that it has been articulated so well by my colleagues on this floor on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, and I am honored just to be a part of that.

But we took on the war on terror. And it is interesting to me that before our troops went into Afghanistan, there was much objection to the foolhardy nature of mounting a military operation in a country that had never been invaded successfully and occupied before in all of history. And yet that took place successfully on the part of our United States military, working with our coalition forces, many of our coalition forces.

They said it couldn't be done. They said it was another Vietnam. They said the passes in the mountains would be impassable, and no one could sustain a military operation through there because they would be ambushed over and over again, and that the people in Afghanistan couldn't handle freedom. They had never had that freedom before. They had never voted there before. This wasn't the kind of people that could handle freedom.

Well, they were right about one thing, Mr. Speaker. They had never voted there before. But there were American soldiers and American Marines that were on the ground guarding the travel routes to the polling places, guarding the polling places, and I am very proud of the Iowa National Guardsmen that were there at that time on that soil that provided an opportunity for the Afghani people for the first time in the history of the world since Adam and Eve to go to the polls and choose their leaders and direct their national destiny of 25 million people, a huge accomplishment when that liberty bell rang across the globe. And the inspiration that comes from that carries over to the issue of Iraq, Mr. Speaker.

Now, this issue with Iraq, it is the same size country; 25 million people in Afghanistan, 25 million people until Iraq. The complaint I hear on the other side of the aisle is that Secretary Rumsfeld and President Bush didn't listen to the military advisers because the people on the other side of the aisle found a general that disagreed. I don't know if it was a Sunday afternoon or Monday morning quarterback, but they found a general that disagreed.

Well, I understand there are about 9,000 generals in our military, and if you can find one that disagrees, in fact,

I saw six that disagreed, and it takes a long time to gather those kind of people.

I will bet that some of those people will show up in the campaigns for the Presidency working for candidates by the year 2008. I expect I will see some of those generals that claim that they counseled for the opposite, working with and for Presidential candidates, for Democrats on the other side of the aisle. I am not suggesting that they have a motive, I am just suggesting that they have a different philosophy about the future of America, even though they are generals and even though they are literally a handful out of the 9,000 generals that we have.

□ 1845

But the advice that the President followed and the advice that Secretary Rumsfeld followed was the same people advising in Afghanistan for the most part as advised in Iraq. The same number of people, Mr. Speaker, 25 million people in Afghanistan, 25 million people in Iraq.

We heard the same arguments:

It's another Vietnam.

It's a quagmire.

You never can do that.

No one could go into Iraq and invade and occupy that country.

We didn't, really. We liberated them. We had an armored column go across Iraq to Baghdad in less time than ever in the history of the world. Baghdad, itself, was the largest city ever in the history of the world to be invaded and occupied by a foreign power. Absolutely a true statement. Berlin was the next largest that I could find, and that was far smaller than Baghdad.

But they only occupied it for a split second as they erroneously put up the American flag and then realized, This is the wrong message to send to the Iraqi people. We're here to liberate you. And they ran the Iraqi flag back up the flagpole. You haven't seen an American flag fly around there since then because the Iraqi people are liberated. They give me smiles, and they give me thumbs up when I go to that country because they are still grateful.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania that has been on the floor so many hours here in the last couple of weeks, he finds a different view. You can find whatever it is that you want to support your argument, Mr. Speaker. But in this case, I stand with our soldiers. I stand with our marines. I stand with the judgment that said, go to Iraq. And, in fact, there have been some announcements today that I could take up in a little bit.

I am very happy at this time to yield so much time as he may consume to my friend Mr. EHLERS for any remarks he may choose to make.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

I didn't want to interrupt your beautiful soliloquy, it was fascinating, but I came to the floor because I heard those who were speaking before you, and I

couldn't believe what I was hearing. They were members of the other party describing in great detail how horrible Republicans are.

Now, I don't know who they were talking about. They weren't talking about you. They weren't talking about me. They are not talking about any of my other Republican colleagues here. But you would literally think the world was ending.

I have to tell you, Mr. KING, how refreshing it is to come to the floor and hear you give this beautiful speech without condemning the other party, but simply outlining where you are coming from in a very careful, thoughtful way. I really, truly appreciate your expression of your beliefs about where the country should go and what is happening, without throwing rocks or mud or condemning anyone else, but simply outlining very beautifully what you believe.

Now, if I may, I would just like to add a few comments. You live in northwest Iowa. I was born in southwest Minnesota, just a few miles from there. I think we have come from the same framework. Maybe that is another reason why I appreciate so much what you have been saying.

You said when you were born, your glass was half full. Mine actually was about one-eighth full, simply because I grew up in a family with considerable poverty, poverty of money, but great richness of persons, of my parents and my siblings, great richness of faith. Frankly, that has always meant more to me than money. I am not a rich man. I never had very high incomes. The highest income I ever received is from the Congress of the United States.

My point is that there is more than money to this life. That is what you were illustrating as well. My cup was one-eighth full, also, because I had serious illness, and I wasn't ever able to go to school. I was home-schooled before there was such a thing as home schooling. Through the love of my family, the encouragement of my family and friends, I survived that situation, and I did well in college, I did well in graduate school, and I ended up getting a Ph.D. in nuclear physics and teaching physics until I ended up in the political arena.

So even though the glass was one-eighth full, it is overflowing and has been overflowing most of my life because of these circumstances.

If I may add one final thought in response to the comments you made about the dot.com bubble. There is no question about it. That dot.com bubble really was a tremendous economic boom to this country. If you look back over the past 50 years, most of the economic growth has come from our investment in science and in scientific research. The dot.com bubble is a good example of that. Development of the Internet. It is amusing because I was using the Internet before the rest of the world knew it existed. It was a wonderful thing. But we were using it

as scientists to transmit voluminous amounts of data back and forth around the world. And then someone gets the bright idea, hey, I bet the public would like to use this, too, and that was the start of the dot.com boom.

As a scientist, I believe it is absolutely essential for our Nation to continue supporting research, the basic research. In the old days of monopolies, AT&T had Bell Labs. They could do the research. IBM had their labs. They did research. In today's globally competitive world, that is not possible. The government has to do the basic research, and from that industry develops the products that become very, very useful to us.

And so I appreciate the point you made about that. I just want to emphasize, let's support the research that will continue having this country be the leader throughout the world in developing these products. I often find people saying, what do you need that research for? I remember when I was a graduate student, one of my colleagues at Berkeley developed nuclear magnetic resonance. It was a wonderful thing to investigate matter with. That is what he was doing. But, lo and behold, that is the basis of the MRI machine which has been the most powerful diagnostic tool that medicine has ever seen. Similarly with the CAT scan, developed out of some work we were doing at Berkeley. X-rays, discovered by a physicist. All basic research with very direct, practical implications for the world today.

I know this is a sidetrack from the point you were making, but this is what makes America great: the creative ability that we have. We worry about losing jobs to other countries, but our creative instinct is what is going to help us win that battle. We don't have the low wages they do. I am glad we don't. But the point is because of our creative juices in this country, we come up with these great ideas. The greatest country that this planet has ever seen, the greatest ideas of freedom for everyone, and the creative ability to meet the challenges and meet the needs of the people of this world today.

I thank you for yielding some time. I just wanted to add those few thoughts to your beautiful comments. Thank you very much.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, my friend, Mr. EHLERS. I appreciate your input on that. I would say with regard to that, that I believe that there is a unique American character, a unique American culture; there is a vibrancy within this overarching American culture that causes us to sometimes challenge the rules, sometimes look into the science, sometimes wonder why cannot that be, why can't we accomplish that. There is a creativity that comes within this culture, this vibrancy that we have, and it is based and rooted in our freedom and in our property rights and in the reward that comes from that, when, say, a Bill Gates comes up in our lifetime and in

a matter of a couple of decades turns himself into the richest man in the world. And what a thing he has done for the standard of living and the quality of life for everybody on this planet.

Mr. EHLERS. If I may, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would yield.

Mr. EHLERS. I would just like to add a little comment to that because I speak to a lot of high school students. Of course, as you know, they look down on nerds. And so I start out by asking them, What type of person is the richest man in the world? That comes out. I say, He's a nerd. I say, And I'm a nerd.

Isn't there a message here? Nerds can succeed in this world. And then I tell these high school kids, look, it is very important to think about the courses that you are taking in high school, because that is going to determine your life. And then the coup de grace, and, of course, I am partial to this. I used to always tell them, If you aren't a nerd, you're going to end up working for a nerd. So I tell them to get busy, study their math and their science, and they will be successful in this life, too, in many ways.

Thank you very much.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, you and Mr. Gates both are giving nerds a good name.

Taking up from there, the issue of the balanced budget by the people on the other side of the aisle. I spoke to what happened here in the nineties to balance the budget and what happened to the economy when the dot.com bubble burst and the 9/11 attacks came, and we had to invest billions and billions into homeland security and invest billions and billions into the overall global war on terror. Things will go fast on you in a hurry when you have got to do quick reaction, but the tax cuts have brought a lot of that back. We are moving in the right direction.

I am willing to balance this budget. The people on the other side of the aisle are willing to balance the budget if they can raise somebody else's taxes, not their constituents' taxes, but perhaps my constituents' taxes. But I would balance this budget. It is a simple equation. And we always should know what it takes to balance the budget and know whether we are willing to do so or not and have a debate here on this floor, Mr. Speaker. That really hasn't happened a lot of times.

But I would submit that if we were to balance this budget, this one that we are in the process now with doing our appropriations bills for the 2007 fiscal year, what it would take is, we have the entitlement spending for Social Security, for Medicare and Medicaid. That goes on. Unless we change the policy there, those expenses are already locked in, and they grow year by year. Interest is something that as long as there is debt, there will be interest. That is also locked in, and it will grow. Those are the entitlements, the automatic spending, if you will. We

also have defense spending, which is necessary.

I would take that defense spending off the table as far as something that I am willing to cut. I want to make sure that our military have all the best equipment, the best training, the best protective devices, and that they are properly taken care of and well fed and well housed. I believe we are doing that better than any military ever in the history of the world.

So what is left is called discretionary spending, these items where we could actually go in and cut some of this spending, this spending that is not on autopilot, and what it would take to balance the fiscal year 2007 budget, when you take nondefense discretionary spending, and that is that smaller piece of the pie, and I have forgotten exactly the percentage that is, but take what we spent in 2006 and cut it 5 percent. If we simply spent 95 percent of the money that we spent on nondefense discretionary spending, that part that we can actually control, if we cut that 5 percent and spent 95 percent of what we spent in 2006 for 2007, we would have a balanced budget, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we might have a balanced budget with a little bit less than that because our revenue has been coming in more than we anticipated, significantly more, because the economy is doing better than we anticipated. That is part, also, of the climate that we are working in. And part of it is also because the dynamics of the Bush tax cuts. The two rounds of Bush tax cuts are the reasons why the economy is going better than we anticipated.

So we will get there over time. I think we should be more aggressive in cutting our spending. I have been working to do that. Many of us have. We don't have the votes in this Congress to do that. But the people on the other side of the aisle are not willing to cut a dollar anywhere. They are only willing to raise taxes on somebody else's constituents. And then they say, Give me a balanced budget. That equation doesn't work, Mr. Speaker.

The equation that will work is cut the spending. It is the spending, not the taxes. If you raise the taxes, you lower the overall revenue because people will stop doing business. What you tax, you get less of. That is the equation.

And the concern about the national debt, let's get to this balanced budget. In fact, let's get to a surplus budget, and let's start paying down the national debt. We did some of that in the middle nineties. If we can do that, we can work this national debt down. It is not a matter of the difference so much of which country that might be holding that United States paper. You see that on the map that Japan holds a lot, China holds a lot, but that is not the issue so much as it is the size of that debt and the willingness to pare down our spending, and the willingness to stop creating new programs and elimi-

nate the programs that are no longer necessary and get rid of this unnecessary funding for the programs that would embarrass a person to have to vote for them and rolling them up into an omnibus spending bill or into a conference report without having a chance to strike them out by line item.

□ 1900

Those are the things we need to do, Mr. Speaker, and so we can get to a reduction of our national debt. We are going to have to do that with a dynamic economy and reducing the growth in our spending.

I would submit also that we need to do some overhaul in Medicare and Medicaid and in Social Security, and this is another way that we get a handle on this budget. Otherwise, Social Security grows and becomes out of control. It was not the people on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that pulled down the effort to overhaul and reform Social Security and give people control of some of their own retirement funds. It was the people on that side of the aisle, and that is another reason why we do not have control over this budget. But it is not imminent, and if it is not in imminent threat, that means that politics and this democracy as some call it, I call it a constitutional republic, will not operate unless there happens to be an imminent need and urgency to get that accomplished.

Let me also, Mr. Speaker, speak about the balance of trade, and we have a negative balance of trade. A year ago it was a minus \$617.7 billion. We got the report out near the end of February this year, and I do not have the exact number in front of me, but it was in the neighborhood of minus \$725 million, growing at the rate of about 20 percent a year increase in the negative balance of trade, meaning that we are buying more goods from other countries, goods and services from other countries, than we are selling to them.

We are to the point even where agriculture, which always used to be a big surplus for us, is narrowing down to where there is hardly a margin at all for agriculture, and the way it is going it is probably going to be a trade imbalance. It could be in the red just for agriculture in a few years at the rate that it is going.

But if we are down to minus \$725 billion a year in this balance of trade, that means that we are buying \$725 billion more of goods and services from foreign countries than we are selling to them, and that has got to be turned around. That is a sign that we are not manufacturing as much as we should, we are not marketing as much as we should, and it should tell us that we need to do some things with our tax structure so that we can adjust our taxes and provide those incentives to be able to produce and market in foreign countries in a more competitive fashion.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I will come back to that in a little bit, but before

I had the colloquy with Mr. EHLERS, I was talking about Iraq and about Afghanistan and Iraq and the global war on terror. I would like to take us back to that, that global war on terror, and specifically the battlefield, the theater of Iraq, which is a major component of that. We know that that is the central battle in the war on terror.

We know that Zarqawi wrote a letter a couple of years ago that was about 17 pages long, as I read it, and he said in there that they were having a great trouble, that Iraq was essentially their last need out; that they did not have mountains or forests to hide in; that they had to find a way that they could hide in the homes of the Iraqi people; and that the Iraqis that were willing to take them in, the terrorists, the al Qaeda that had been operating in Iraq now since liberation of Iraq, the Iraqis that were willing to take them into their homes, which is the only place to hide, you do not hide so well out there in the desert, were as rare as red sulfur. Mr. Speaker, as rare as red sulfur. Now, I am going to have to do some research sometime to determine how rare red sulfur is, but I expect that is quite a rare commodity and the Iraqis who would take them are rare.

Well, they are even more rare today than they were then when Zarqawi not too long ago, a couple of weeks ago, was sent to meet his Maker by two bombs from two different F-16s. When he was sent to meet his Maker in the rubble of the so-called safehouse, now there is an oxymoron is it not, Mr. Speaker, a safehouse that Zarqawi was hiding in turned out to not be so safe because intelligence had gotten information to our military and our military had targeted the house and dropped a couple of bombs in on him, killed Zarqawi. In the rubble were computer hard drives and paperwork and a lot of intelligence, and a lot of intelligence has led us to other intelligence, and a lot of other intelligence that we had were dots out there that got connected by the intel that was within this so-called safehouse that was turned into rubble.

From all of that intelligence, the body of that intelligence as it has been released to the public and our intelligence people have pored down through it, the body of that intelligence says that al Qaeda and the terrorists in Iraq are in a very difficult situation. They are having trouble recruiting fighters. They are having trouble getting military supplies and munitions. They are having trouble with their communications. Their operations are being disrupted, and that the effectiveness of the coalition forces, and I will say in particular American forces, and especially the effectiveness of the Iraqi troops that are now in uniform defending Iraqis and taking on these terrorists in the midst have al Qaeda in disarray.

All of the information that came, all of the data came, all of the intelligence that came, all pointed to the same

thing. This is a desperate enemy and a desperate condition with a very limited amount of supplies to work with, a limited amount of recruitment ability to be able to recruit troops and a limited ability to affect life in Iraq.

We are winning, Mr. Speaker, and it has become very clear as the intelligence unfolded.

I would point out also that Saddam's trial is nearing its end, and we are going to see a verdict in Saddam Hussein pretty soon, and it has been drug on now for about 8 months. That is plenty long, but in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that we are going to get a verdict. I happen to know that if he is found guilty of crimes against humanity that in that section of the Criminal Code of the Iraqi law, and I have actually sat there with the judges in Baghdad and discussed this with them, and they spoke English to me so I could understand it directly and not be dependent upon an interpreter, but in that section of Iraqi law, crimes against humanity only provide for one penalty. If you are guilty, there is only one penalty, and that penalty is death.

Now, there have been three of Saddam's attorneys that have been murdered throughout the process of this, and some of the other people involved in this have been as well, but the punishment that may come if Saddam is found guilty is only one punishment. He has been, of course, an active person there, I will say, since there is a case before the court in Iraq. We know the evidence, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to let the evidence speak for itself at this point.

But I would say that Iraq is coming along. They are making good progress. They now have a sovereign government. They now have a full cabinet. They now have a prime minister. When you get a sovereign government, they can make decisions. They can make decisions about like what to do if Saddam is found guilty, whether they will bring another trial for other crimes against humanity, whether they will mete the punishment should he be found guilty, what they should be doing for their citizens.

I hope they do this: open a bidding process globally so they can bring in oil companies that have the capital and the technical ability to sink more wells into the vast oil fields in Iraq and build some pipelines and some refineries and get more oil coming out of that country so they can get cash coming in.

It is a shame to have \$70 oil in a country that is starved for cash and that has oil sitting underneath its sandy desert and not having that turning into cash at \$70 a barrel for them. I want to see that happen. This was not American blood for oil, but this was American blood, coalition blood and Iraqi blood for freedom, for freedom, Mr. Speaker, and they will have the freedom to do with their oil as they choose and to cash the checks for that

oil, and they need to get it flowing out of there. That would be the first order of business besides the security issues that come before this government, if I were the prime minister or in the parliament of Iraq.

So this military security situation is making good progress, and the intelligence that we have gathered and after the death of Zarqawi, their leader, and they have taken on a number of their leaders in the first and second tier who were very close to Zarqawi, but after that, all the intelligence says they are in desperate condition.

Now, why would we do what has been proposed here on the other side of the aisle, why would we pull out? Why would we cut and run? Why would we want to redeploy to the horizon, Mr. Speaker, when this war is making progress and we have people who have this opportunity to be free?

I sat down with Benazir Bhutto shortly after the September 11 attacks, and she happened to be giving a speech in my district at the Buena Vista University in Clear Lake, my hometown. Benazir Bhutto is the former prime minister of Pakistan. She served at two separate segments of time there in Pakistan and is a very respected leader of the Pakistani people and has a sound judgment, which is the reason that she has been able to be in power in Pakistan.

I asked her a question and I was trying to understand at the time our enemy, how do we conduct a war that we could finally get to the point where we can declare victory, what would victory look like and how do we get to that point so we could declare victory. We need to define it and we need to get there.

We were talking about radical Islamists, that perhaps 10 percent of the Muslim world are lined up against Muslims, as well as Christians and Jews and an attack on Western civilization to some degree, and how do we finally defeat them. Her answer was, this hatred comes out of having no hope. It comes out of not having an opportunity to build a better life for their families, for their homes and their communities. She said, you have got to give them freedom; you have got to give them a chance at, she used the word, democracy.

If they have that freedom, like we have here, then they turn their focus to hatred and murder and barbaric slaughtering like they did of our two soldiers a couple of days ago in Iraq. They turn that hatred over, and they put their efforts towards their families, their community, their churches, their mosques, their countries. When that happens, that energy that is within all of us is used for a constructive good. There is a culture change. That culture of hatred that breeds terror that is in the heart of poverty and hopelessness that is in many of the cities, especially in the Arab world, can be replaced by freedom and hope and prosperity.

That is the definition for victory, Mr. Speaker. That is the definition that

was given to me in a very private conversation, without any reservations I would add, by Benazir Bhutto. I appreciate that from her. I respect that from her, and I think she laid that out in a way that indexes in, links in very well with the Bush doctrine.

President Bush understands this. He came out with this philosophy within weeks of September 11, and he stuck by this philosophy all along. He has defined victory. He is leading us to victory. We need to stand with him on that issue, and I do, and standing with the President also stands with our soldiers and marines, and it stands with them and it stands with their mission. Those two things, Mr. Speaker, are linked together.

If you are going to support your marines, you also have to support the mission that they are on because some of them have given their lives. Some more of them will give their lives for global freedom and for the freedom and safety of the American people. They have to believe in their mission. I believe in their mission. The President believes in their mission. The American people believe in their mission, and some of the people on the other side of the aisle do not, and they claim that they can support the troops and oppose the mission.

I would think that there is not a soldier in this country that would say send me off on a mission that you do not support but tell me you support me. No one could be asked, and you cannot ask anyone to put their life on the line for a mission that you do not believe in. That is the crux of this debate: Do you support the troops and the mission. And that is not negotiable.

Then, as I talked about balancing this Federal budget, there is also this imbalance in trade that I was talking about, \$725 billion imbalance in trade. What we need to do with that, Mr. Speaker, is fix that. We need to fix that by changing the tax policy. The tax policy that we have now taxes all productivity in America. I spoke about that a little bit earlier, and in fact, we can change that around totally and utterly.

I came to this conclusion in 1980 after the IRS had audited me one too many times in a row. When they did that, I went back to work after 4 days of pulling papers out of my files and handing them over to the IRS and sitting there throughout this audit. When it was finally done, it cost me some money, and I believe to this day I did everything exactly legally and technically correct. It was my intent to do so, but they I believe had to justify their 4 days in my office. So they made a Monday morning quarterback decision, and I had to accept the result of that if I were going to stay in business because I could not take anymore capital out of my business or anymore time away from our productivity to go fight the behemoth system of the Federal Government.

So I went back to work, and as I went back to work I began to start with this conclusion: I would like to eliminate the Internal Revenue Service. I would like to eliminate the IRS code. I would like to see to it that no one has to go through what I went through ever again.

□ 1915

I would like to have people have a voluntary tax system so that they can decide when they pay their taxes. And as I worked this system out, Mr. Speaker, and I really put together a fairly complete proposal on my own as I was sitting in the seat of a bulldozer meditating for 10 or 12 hours a day, and there is plenty of time to think there, I thought about this policy, and this policy today is called H.R. 25, The Fair Tax.

Now, I couldn't find anybody that knew anything about this issue in 1980, but as I worked my way through that, throughout that decade, I found a little more information and a little more information, and by about 1991, I found a book written by Daniel Pilla, a former IRS agent, called *Fire the IRS*. He had worked for the IRS for years, and in that book he had done the data, had pulled the data together and done the research that supported the conclusions that I had drawn just simply from working my way through this policy. I didn't do the math, but he did. He did the analysis, and his analysis fit my philosophy.

We linked together at that point. I don't know if Daniel Pilla ever recognized that, but I want to thank him for the work he did on that book. It was inspiring to me and confirmed my conclusion and helped move me into public life.

I believe that we should take all tax off of productivity. I think as a fundamental change, if we do that and put it on consumption, then people can volunteer to pay taxes. They will do that when they make a decision to purchase. We take all the Federal tax off of all productivity. That means you get to keep all the money you earn, with the exception of whatever State taxes might be there.

People in America would get another 56 percent more into their paycheck. If they got a \$1,000 check for that week, they would have \$1,560 more they would get to take home. If it was a \$100 check that week, it would be \$156 more they would take home. That extra money, that 56 percent more, is money that would be saved and some would be spent, but people would make a decision on paying their taxes themselves without having the IRS stand there, or more figuratively Uncle Sam standing at the time clock on Monday morning.

You know, America gets up, takes a shower, shaves, goes to work, and walks through to punch the time clock, and as soon as they punch that time clock, Uncle Sam's hand goes out. He's going to take every dollar that you make that day until he is satisfied.

When he is satisfied, he puts that money in his pocket, Mr. Speaker, and then you can go to work for the State for a little while. They put that in their pocket, and then you are on your own for the rest of the day.

But we can change that entire dynamic where Uncle Sam is no longer standing there. The image won't be of Uncle Sam by the time clock any longer, it will be the image of your being able to get all the money you earn and then be able to decide when to pay taxes with it.

Alexander Tyler said, when a majority of the people figure out that they can vote themselves benefits from the public Treasury, on that day democracy ceases to exist. Well, we are very close to that because 44 percent of Americans don't pay any income tax right now.

I heard a number the other day, and I have to qualify it because I haven't verified it yet, but it was that 3 percent of the people pay 97 percent of the taxes. I don't know if that is true, but the philosophy is there. A small percentage of people at the top of the income bracket are paying a large percentage of the income tax on the other side. And many, many people, millions of people are absolved from tax liability whatsoever.

They are not paying taxes, but they are voting, and they are writing letters to their Congressmen and putting demands on government to provide them services. So their incentive is to push people to grow government and to lay back and use more government services, rather than have the incentive be to go out and go to work and grow the size of their own pie, fill their cup, so to speak, feed the goose that lays the golden eggs.

That is what we need to do, Mr. Speaker. We are underproducing in this country. What kind of a Nation would be having a debate about an immigration policy that would take in, they are saying with a straight face, 10- to 12 million people?

I remember when under the Clinton administration, prior to the 1996 elections, they accelerated the naturalization process for a million people, a lot of them in California. Some of them made their way to Iowa, and some of them made it clear what they thought their agreement was, and I will speak about that another time perhaps, Mr. Speaker, but a million people came in prior to the 1996 Presidential elections.

I was appalled that a million people could come into the United States like that, without having a real policy established here in this Congress, but just simply let across the border, naturalized, legalized, and given an opportunity to vote. But we are, and as appalled as I was by a million people in 1996, the United States Senate now is speaking openly about 10- to 12 million people, and I think they know what I believe and what my senior Senator believes, and that is that the number is not 10- or 12 million, it is more like 20-

or 22 million, or a number greater than that. And we are talking seriously, Mr. Speaker, about legalizing all of those people that are here in the United States, or all but a relative handful of the people here in the United States illegally.

Now, the justification for it would be because we don't have enough Americans that are willing to do the work that needs to be done. Mr. Speaker, I object to that kind of thinking and that kind of talk. It is an insult to the hard-working Americans that are out there, those that took pride, like Mr. EHLERS, who grew up with his cup one-eighth full. I said mine was half full, and not because of wealth, because we weren't well off, but because of family, and because of our work ethic, and the culture that I grew up in was a tremendous head start to be anchored in that way.

But here we sit now with the argument that Americans won't do this work. Well, they may not do it for 4 bucks an hour. No, Mr. Speaker, in fact, they may not do it for \$5.15 an hour. But there is supply and demand in the labor force, and the labor in this country has been altered and distorted by 10- or 12- or 20 million people in this country. And all of them are not working, it is a percentage of them. That number is somewhere over 50 percent, or about seven-twelfths would be one way of looking at that.

All of them are not working, but perhaps 6.3 to 7 million, according to a CIS study, are working. And so let's say it is 7 million people. I referenced earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that there are 7.5 million unemployed in America. There are another 5.3 million that have exhausted their unemployment benefits that are still looking for a job. So you get up there to 12.8 million. That is already more people on unemployment, at least by the statistics the Senate is dealing with, who are here illegally. It is almost two to one for those working that are here illegally.

And then, if we look at those who are on welfare, there are about 4.3 million of those. If we take a look at teenagers, and teenagers need to be busy. One of the good things about raising kids is if you can keep them busy, if they have energy and you keep them busy, they will be all right, but you have to work them a little to do that. And so of those between the ages of 16 and 19, there are 9.3 million of them who are not in the workforce in any way, not even part time, not even flipping burgers down at the hamburger stand or picking up a check whatsoever. 9.3 million. Some of them presumably could be hired to do some of the work they claim Americans aren't doing.

Then if you look at the, I will say the young senior citizens, between the ages of 65 and 69, there are about 4½ million of those. Some of those would like to be working, but we have a few disincentives in place so that they do not. That is a universe to go and hire from; 7.5

million and 5.3 million and 9.3 million, and then the 4.5 or so million that are the young seniors.

But in between the ages of 20 and 64, that real working age, none of those people have been addressed yet, except for the welfare folks that I am talking about. There are 51 million not working Americans there.

But even if I pare this down and take those that are over 70, actually I haven't spoken to those at all, but those over 70 out of it, those over 65 out of it, and if we go down and take those under the age of 16 out of this equation, and we roll this all back together and think what is the universe, what is the size that we hire from for our workforce, that force, Mr. Speaker, that workforce is about 61 million.

That is a reasonable number to look at. And we are trying to hire perhaps 7 million people to replace? If we did that, we would hire maybe one out of nine of the nonworking people that are of primary working age in the United States. We surely should be able to do that.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we could also replace some of these jobs with technology, but we will not do that as long as there is a very cheap labor supply to go to. Cheap labor causes employers to de-adopt technology, and that is a retrogression of our economy when that happens. We need to be driving technology not de-adopting technology. That technology would reduce some of the demand for that labor.

No one, no one I know of, has addressed the subject of how much of this 7 million people that are doing this work, which is only 2.2 percent of the gross domestic product, in other words the illegals are about 4.6 or 7 percent of the workforce, and they are about 2.2 percent of the productivity, that work-

force is not all necessary work, Mr. Speaker.

I will conclude this statement on another evening, but I appreciate the privilege to address the House, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5638, PERMANENT ESTATE TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2006

Mr. PUTNAM (during Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-517) on the resolution (H. Res. 885) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5638) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified credit against the estate tax to an exclusion equivalent of \$5,000,000 and to repeal the sunset provision for the estate and generation-skipping taxes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4890, LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO ACT OF 2006

Mr. PUTNAM (during Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-518) on the resolution (H. Res. 886) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4890) to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. CLYBURN, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 28.
- Ms. HARRIS, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, June 22, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the fourth quarter of 2005 and the first and second quarter of 2006, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. MIKE THOMPSON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 26 AND JAN. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mike Thompson	1/26	1/28	Kuwait		812.00		(³)				812.00
	1/28	1/29	Iraq				(³)				
	1/29	1/30	Germany		304.00		(³)				304.00
Committee total					1,116.00						1,116.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

MIKE THOMPSON, Chairman, May 23, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. MIKE THOMPSON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 26 AND JAN. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mike Thompson	1/26	1/28	Kuwait		812.00		(³)				812.00
	1/28	1/29	Iraq				(³)				
	1/29	1/30	Germany		304.00		(³)				304.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. MIKE THOMPSON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 26 AND JAN. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Committee total					1,116.00						1,116.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

MIKE THOMPSON, Chairman, May 3, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. DENNIS KING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 21 AND JAN. 28, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Dennis King	1/22	1/28	Republic of Korea	2,111,480	2,148.00		4,310.62				6,458.62
Committee total					2,148.00		4,310.62				6,458.62

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LANE EVANS, Chairman, Feb. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. WILLIAM VAN HORNE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 21 AND FEB. 25, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
William Van Horne	2/21	2/25	Austria		528.00		5,704.72		404.53		6,637.25
Committee total					528.00		5,704.72		404.53		6,637.25

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WILLIAM VAN HORNE, Mar. 13, 2006.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. SUSAN OLSEN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 4 AND MAR. 9, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Susan Olson	3/05	3/09	Belgium		1,528.00		6,408.31				7,936.31
Committee total					1,528.00		6,408.31				7,936.31

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Mar. 22, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. TIMOTHY SCOTT BERGREEN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 8 AND APR. 15, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Timothy S. Bergreen	4/8	4/15	China		1,492.00		7,228.70				8,720.70
Committee total					1,492.00		7,228.70				8,720.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

—Apr. 24, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. CHRISTOPHER McCANNELL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 8 AND APR. 15, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Christopher McCannell	4/8	4/15	China		492.00		7,228.70				8,720.70
Committee total					492.00		7,228.70				8,720.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

—May 22, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. MICHAEL W. SHEEHY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 9 AND APR. 14, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Michael W. Sheehy	4/09	4/11	United Kingdom	503	1,574.00					503	1,574.00
	4/11	4/13	Qatar	1,390			9,405.74			1,390	9,405.74
Committee total					1,574.00		9,405.74				10,979.74

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MICHAEL W. SHEEHY, May 9, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. CHRIS CONNELLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 18 AND APR. 22, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Chris Connelly	4/18	4/21	Austria		528.00						528.00
	4/21	4/22	Czech Republic		370.00						370.00
Committee total					898.00						898.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

May 4, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, REV. DANIEL P. COUGHLIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 18 AND APR. 24, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel P. Coughlin	4/18	4/22	Italy		738.00						738.00
	4/22	4/24	Germany		368.00						368.00
Committee total					1,106.00						1,106.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL P. COUGHLIN, May 4, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY, SUDAN, SOUTH AFRICA, GHANA, LIBERIA AND CAPE VERDE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 16 AND FEB. 24, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
Hon. Joe Wilson	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
Hon. Jim Clyburn	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
Hon. Mel Watt	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
Hon. Maxine Waters	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
Hon. Carolyn Kilpatrick	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
Hon. George Miller	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
Hon. Barbara Lee	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
Hon. Jan Schakowsky	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY, SUDAN, SOUTH AFRICA, GHANA, LIBERIA AND CAPE VERDE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 16 AND FEB. 24, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Michael Capuano	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(³)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(³)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(³)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(³)				119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(³)				
Hon. Donald Payne	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(³)			11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(³)			183.56	218.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(³)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(³)				119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(³)				
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(³)			11,700	130.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(³)				
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(³)				
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(³)				
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(³)				
John Lawrence	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
Gregory Simpkins	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
Deborah Spriggs	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
Jennifer Crider	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
Michael Sheehy	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
	2/18	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
Committee total											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

NANCY PELOSI, Chairman, Mar. 22, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN ASSEMBLY MEETING IN BRUSSELS, BELGIUM AND NATO P.A. MEETING WITH ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PARIS, FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 17 AND FEB. 23, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Joel Hefley	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Hon. John Boozman	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Hon. Ben Chandler	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Hon. Jo Ann Emerson	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/22	France		469.00		3,381.41				5,930.41
Hon. Randy Forbes	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Hon. Paul Gillmor	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Hon. Dennis Moore	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Hon. Mike Ross	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Hon. John Tanner	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Hon. Ellen Tauscher	2/17	2/22	Belgium		2,600.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		3,242.05				5,842.05
Hon. Tom Udall	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Susan Olson	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Melissa Adamson	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Andrew Beck	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Kathy Becker	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Paul Gallis	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Debbie Gebhardt	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Kay King	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Fran Marcucci	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Patrick Prisco	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(³)				

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN ASSEMBLY MEETING IN BRUSSELS, BELGIUM AND NATO P.A. MEETING WITH ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PARIS, FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 17 AND FEB. 23, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Delegation Expenses:	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(³)				3,018.00
Representational Functions									4,071.96		4,071.96
Miscellaneous									1,279.50		1,279.50
Committee total					59,473.00				5,351.46		71,447.92

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Mar. 28, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO EAST TIMOR AND INDONESIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 19 AND FEB. 24, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jim Kolbe	2/19	2/22	Indonesia		1,093.00		(³)				1,093.00
Hon. Lois Capps	2/19	2/22	Indonesia		1,093.00		(³)				1,093.00
Hon. Adam Schiff	2/19	2/22	Indonesia		1,093.00		(³)				1,093.00
Hon. Allyson Schwartz	2/19	2/22	Indonesia		1,093.00		(³)				1,093.00
Hon. Robert Lawrence	2/19	2/22	Indonesia		1,093.00		(³)				1,093.00
Hon. Jim Kolbe	2/22	2/23	East Timor		193.40		(³)				193.40
Hon. Lois Capps	2/22	2/23	East Timor		193.40		(³)				193.40
Hon. Adam Schiff	2/22	2/23	East Timor		193.40		(³)				193.40
Hon. Allyson Schwartz	2/22	2/23	East Timor		193.40		(³)				193.40
Hon. Robert Lawrence	2/22	2/23	East Timor		265.40		(³)				265.40
Committee total											6,504.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Mar. 15, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BELGIUM (BRUSSELS) AND AUSTRIA (VIENNA), HOUSE REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 19 AND FEB 25, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	2/19	2/22	Belgium	964.93	1,146.00					964.93	1,146.00
	2/22	2/25	Austria	442.46	528.00					442.46	528.00
Fred L. Turner	2/19	2/22	Belgium	964.93	1,146.00					964.93	1,146.00
	2/22	2/25	Austria	442.46	528.00					442.36	528.00
Committee total											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Mar. 2, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BRITISH AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY GROUP MEETINGS IN LONDON, ENGLAND, UNITED KINGDOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 23 AND FEB. 27, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Thomas E. Petri	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		2,112.00		3,586.50				5,698.50
Hon. Todd Akin	2/23	2/26	United Kingdom		1,653.80		559.58				2,213.38
Hon. John Boozman	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Hon. Ben Chandler	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Hon. Randy Forbes	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Hon. Paul Gillmor	2/23	2/26	United Kingdom		1,374.60		3,666.93				5,041.53
Hon. Joel Hefley	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Hon. Dennis Moore	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Hon. Mike Ross	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Hon. John Tanner	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Hon. Tom Udall	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Hon. Edward Whitfield	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		2,112.00		\$7,253.43				9,365.43
Debra Gebhardt	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Meissa Adamson	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Kathy Becker	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Dr. Paul Gallis	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Dr. Kay King	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Fran Marcucci	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Susan Olson	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Patrick Prisco	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Andrew Beck	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(³)				1,832.80
Representational									1,370.75		1,370.75
Committee total					38,410.00		15,066.44		1,370.75		54,847.19

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

THOMAS E. PETRI, Chairman, Mar. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO UNITED ARAB EMIRATES AND AFGHANISTAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 24 AND MAR. 1, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Robert Lawrence	2/25	2/25	UAE	424.21	2,238.06	2,662.27
Thomas Ross	2/24	2/25	UAE	424.21	3,397.00	3,821.21
Robert Lawrence	2/26	3/01	Afghanistan	360.00	3,080.19	3,440.19
Thomas Ross	2/26	3/01	Afghanistan	360.00	3,640.44	4,000.44
Committee total											13,924.11

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Mar. 15, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO VALLE DE BRAVO, MEXICO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 2 AND MAR. 4, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jim Kolbe	3/2	3/4	Mexico	600.71	600.71
Hon. Michael McCaul	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Hon. David Drier	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Hon. Donald A. Manzullo	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Hon. William D. Delahunt	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	3/2	3/4	Mexico	600.71	600.71
Hon. Phil English	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Hon. Jerry Weller	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	200.00	843.62
Hon. Susan Davis	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Hon. Luis Fortuno	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Patrick Baugh	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Eric Jacobstein	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Bar Forsyth	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Jim Farr	3/2	3/4	Mexico	600.70	600.70
Ted Brennan	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Linda Solomon	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Jean Carroll	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Brad Smith	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Jonathan Day	3/2	3/4	Mexico	643.62	643.62
Delegation expenses								3,879.38	3,879.38
Interpreters								3,552.00	3,552.00
Committee total					12,100.24			7,631.38			19,731.42

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JIM KOLBE, Chairman, Mar. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MOROCCO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 20 AND MAR. 25, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Robert Lawrence	3/20	3/25	Morocco	1,490.00	6,024.32	7,514.32
Thomas Ross	3/20	3/25	Morocco	1,490.00	6,024.32	7,514.32
Committee total											15,028.64

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Mar. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GREECE, INDIA AND VIETNAM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 8 AND APR. 15, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Hon. Michael G. Oxley	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Hon. Frank D. Lucas	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Hon. Ray LaHood	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Hon. Randy Neugebauer	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Hon. Dan Boren	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Hon. Bill Livingood	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Scott Palmer	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Ted Van Der Meid	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Margaret Peterlin	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Seth Webb	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Rachel Perry	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
John Russell	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Steve Stombres	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Martha Morrison	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Steve Rusnak	4/08	4/09	Greece	296.00	(3)	296.00
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	4/09	4/12	India	1,293.20	(3)	1,293.20
Hon. Michael G. Oxley	4/09	4/12	India	1,293.20	(3)	1,293.20
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	4/09	4/12	India	1,293.20	(3)	1,293.20
Hon. Frank D. Lucas	4/09	4/12	India	1,293.20	(3)	1,293.20
Hon. Ray LaHood	4/09	4/12	India	1,293.20	(3)	1,293.20
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/09	4/12	India	1,293.20	(3)	1,293.20

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GREECE, INDIA AND VIETNAM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 8 AND APR. 15, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Randy Neugebauer	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon. Dan Boren	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon. Bill Livingood	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Scott Palmer	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Ted Van Der Meid	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Margaret Peterlin	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Seth Webb	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Rachel Perry	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
John Russell	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Steve Stombres	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Martha Morrison	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Steve Rusnak	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Michael G. Oxley	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Frank D. Lucas	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Ray LaHood	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Randy Neugebauer	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Dan Boren	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Bill Livingood	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Scott Palmer	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Ted Van Der Meid	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Margaret Peterlin	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Seth Webb	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Rachel Perry	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
John Russell	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Steve Stombres	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Martha Morrison	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Steven Rusnak	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Committee total											43,383.60

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Janice Helwig	1/11	1/10	United States				5,000.54				5,000.54
	1/31	3/31	Austria		20,556.00						20,556.00
		2/03	Albania		792.00		1,138.87				1,930.87
Committee total					21,348.00		6,139.41				27,487.41

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. Jean Schmidt	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. Stephanie Herse	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. David Scott	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. Frank Lucas	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. Jerry Moran	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Josh Maxwell	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan		—		(3)				—
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq		—		(3)				—
John Haugen	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan		—		(3)				—
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	1/13	1/13	Iraq		—		(3)				—
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
	2/17	2/21	France		1,812.00		(3)				1,812.00
	2/21	2/21	Belgium		—		(3)				—
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
Hon. Collin Peterson	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
	2/17	2/19	France		906.00		(3)				906.00
	2/19	2/21	Belgium		—		(3)	764.00			764.00
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
Hon. Mike McIntyre	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
	2/17	2/21	France		1,812.00		(3)				1,812.00
	2/21	2/21	Belgium		—		(3)				(3)
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
Josh Maxwell	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
	2/17	2/21	France		1,812.00		(3)				1,812.00
	2/21	2/21	Belgium		—		(3)				—
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
Shelley Husband	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
	2/17	2/21	France		1,812.00		(3)				1,812.00
	2/21	2/21	Belgium		—		(3)				—
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
Hon. Steve King	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
	2/19	2/23	Brazil		506.00		(3)				506.00
	2/23	2/26	Argentina		517.00		(3)				517.00
	2/19	2/23	Brazil		506.00		(3)				506.00
Hon. Collin Peterson	2/23	2/26	Argentina		517.00		(3)				517.00
Committee total				36,720		764.00					37,484.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Mike Ringer	1/9	1/13	New Zealand		1,100.15						1,100.15
	1/13	1/17	Antarctica		—						—
	1/17	1/22	New Zealand		1,474.69						1,474.69
Commercial airfare							7,598.26				7,598.26
Misc. transportation costs							20.00				20.00
John Scofield	1/09	1/13	New Zealand		1,100.15						1,100.15
	1/13	1/17	Antarctica		—						—
	1/17	1/22	New Zealand		1,474.69						1,474.69
Commercial airfare							7,626.26				7,626.26
Ann Marie Goldsmith	1/09	1/13	New Zealand		1,100.15						1,100.15
	1/13	1/17	Antarctica		—						—
	1/17	1/22	New Zealand		1,474.69						1,474.69
Commercial airfare							7,626.26				7,626.26
Michelle Burkett	1/09	1/13	New Zealand		1,100.15						1,100.15
	1/13	1/17	Antarctica		—						—
	1/17	1/22	New Zealand		1,474.69						1,474.69
Commercial airfare							7,626.26				7,626.26
Hon. Jim Kolbe	1/02	1/04	Senegal		647.00						647.00
	1/04	1/06	Benin		455.97						455.97
	1/06	1/09	Sudan		358.00						358.00
Hon. Denny Rehberg	1/09	1/11	Uganda		900.00						900.00
	1/11	1/13	Ireland		893.72						893.72
								5,458.73			5,458.73
Commercial airfare								4,159.47		4,159.47	
Misc. embassy costs											
Rob Blair	1/02	1/04	Senegal		647.00						647.00
	1/04	1/06	Benin		455.97						455.97
	1/06	1/09	Sudan		358.00						358.00
Loretta Beaumont	1/09	1/11	Uganda		900.00						900.00
	1/11	1/13	Ireland		893.72						893.72
								5,458.73			5,458.73
Commercial airfare								4,159.47		4,159.47	
Misc. embassy costs											
Hon. Dave Weldon	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/29	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/29	12/29	Iraq		—						—
Loretta Beaumont	12/30	12/30	Kuwait		—						—
	12/30	12/31	Pakistan		804.00						804.00
							13,740.63				13,740.63

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	12/31	1/02	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/02	1/03	Pakistan		178.00						178.00
	1/03	1/04	Ireland		315.81						315.81
Chris Topik	1/19	1/23	Samoa		512.33				79.85		592.18
	1/23	1/26	Fiji		738.00						738.00
Hon. Frank Wolf	1/14	1/17	Egypt		867.00						867.00
	1/17	1/19	Lebanon								
	1/19	1/20	France		375.54						375.54
Return of unused per diem					-257.00						-257.00
Paul Terry	1/10	1/12	Kuwait		812.00						812.00
	1/12	1/17	Qatar		1,169.00						1,169.00
							9,856.95				9,856.95
Hon. Harold Rogers	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
Hon. Martin Sabo	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
Hon. Tom Latham	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
Hon. David Price	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
Ben Nicholson	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
							1,663.00				1,663.00
Beverly Pheto	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
							1,663.00				1,663.00
Hon. Bud Cramer	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.00						834.00
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.00						268.00
John Shank	1/16	1/16	United States		78.00						78.00
	1/17	1/19	Korea		716.00						716.00
	1/19	1/22	Japan		1,224.00						1,224.00
Commerical airfare							2,868.86				2,868.86
David Morrison	1/16	1/16	United States		78.00						78.00
	1/17	1/17	Korea		716.00						716.00
	1/19	1/22	Japan		1,224.00						1,224.00
Commerical airfare							2,819.26				2,819.26
Hon. Jim Kolbe	1/24	1/29	Switzerland		1,860.00						1,860.00
Commerical airfare							3,008.16				3,008.16
Gregory Lankler	1/30	2/1	Qatar		669.14						669.14
	2/1	2/2	Iraq		156.00						156.00
	2/2	2/3	Qatar		312.00						312.00
Commerical airfare							7,417.08				7,417.08
Hon. John T. Doolittle	2/3	2/3	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
	2/4	2/5	Iraq								
	2/5	2/6	Israel		362.00						362.00
	2/6	2/7	Italy		363.00						363.00
Commerical airfare							3,328.00				3,328.00
Hon. Nita Lowey	2/18	2/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
	2/21	2/22	Ecuador		256.00						256.00
	2/21	2/25	Bolivia		494.99						494.99
Misc. embassy costs								2,007.47			2,007.47
Commerical airfare							4,982.50				4,982.50
Nisha Desai	2/18	2/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
	2/21	2/22	Ecuador		256.00						256.00
	2/21	2/25	Bolivia		494.99						494.99
Misc. embassy costs								2,007.47			2,007.47
Commerical airfare							3,672.00				3,672.00
Hon. Jim Kolbe	3/12	3/13	France		921.00						921.00
Craig Higgins	3/12	3/13	France		921.00						921.00
							6,680.00				6,680.00
									26.00		26.00
Carol Murphy	3/20	3/21	Greece		178.00						178.00
	3/21	3/22	Tunisia		215.00						215.00
	3/22	3/24	Italy		1,269.00						1,269.00
							6,115.08				6,115.08
Tim Peterson	3/20	3/21	Greece		178.00						178.00
	3/21	3/22	Tunisia		215.00						215.00
	3/22	3/24	Italy		1,269.00						1,269.00
							6,058.08				6,058.08
Walter Hearne	3/20	3/21	Greece		178.00						178.00
	3/21	3/22	Tunisia		215.00						215.00
	3/22	3/24	Italy		1,269.00						1,269.00
							6,058.08				6,058.08
Hon. Mark Steven Kirk	3/24	3/25	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	3/25	3/26	Iraq								
	3/26	3/27	Jordan		273.00						273.00
Committee total					51,925.63		133,483.91		16,599.19		202,008.73

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATION STAFF), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 2006.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Marilyn J. Harris	2/22	2/24	Germany		737.50		7,987.32		88.12		8,812.94
	2/25	2/26	Sierra Leone		434.00				319.00		753.00
	2/27	3/1	Senegal		561.00				12.14		573.14
Scott J. Kish	2/22	2/24	Germany		737.50		7,987.32		104.22		8,829.04
	2/25	2/26	Sierra Leone		434.00				319.00		753.00
	2/27	3/1	Senegal		561.00				28.24		589.24
Robert H. Pearre	2/22	2/24	Germany		737.50		8,027.32		85.26		8,850.08
	2/25	2/26	Sierra Leone		434.00				319.00		753.00
	2/27	3/1	Senegal		561.00				100.16		661.16
Jennifer L. Rinaca	2/22	2/25	Italy		429.50				30.01		459.51
	2/25	3/1	Ethiopia		990.25		9,453.53		23.63		10,443.38
George Salvatierra	2/22	2/25	Italy		429.50				786.61		1,216.11
	2/25	3/1	Ethiopia		990.25		9,453.53		90.79		10,544.53
H.C. Young	2/22	2/25	Italy		429.50				17.29		546.79
	2/25	3/1	Ethiopia		990.25		9,903.53		89.90		10,983.68

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATION STAFF), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 2006.—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Committee total					9,455.25		52,812.55		2,413.37		64,681.17

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman, Apr. 5, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Germany, Ireland With CODEL Porter, December 26, 2005–January 2, 2006:											
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/28	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/28	12/29	Iraq								
	12/30	1/2	Pakistan		982.00						982.00
	12/31	1/1	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/2	1/3	Ireland		320.00						320.00
Josh Holly	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/28	12/29	Iraq								
	12/30	1/1	Pakistan		982.00						982.00
	12/31	1/1	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/2	1/3	Ireland		320.00						320.00
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Germany, January 8–13, 2006:											
Hon. Rob Simmons	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		137.00						137.00
Hon. Jeb Bradley	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		137.00						137.00
Hon. Neil Abercrombie	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		304.00						304.00
Hon. John Spratt	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		861.00						861.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		57.00						57.00
Steven DeTeresa	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		137.00						137.00
Mark Lewis	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		137.00						137.00
Delegation expenses	1/9	1/12	Kuwait				496.50		3,860.61		4,357.11
Visit to Switzerland, Poland, Romania, Kosovo, Morocco With CODEL Duncan, January 16–26, 2006:											
Hon. Jeff Miller	1/17	1/19	Switzerland		455.70						455.70
	1/19	1/21	Poland		320.00						320.00
	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00						834.00
	1/22	1/22	Kosovo								
	1/24	1/26	Morocco		296.00						296.00
Hon. Solomon Ortiz	1/17	1/19	Switzerland		455.70						455.70
	1/19	1/21	Poland		320.00						320.00
	1/22	1/22	Kosovo								
	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00						834.00
	1/24	1/26	Morocco		296.00						296.00
Visit to the Republic of Korea, January 21–28, 2006:											
Hon. Lane Evans	1/22	1/28	Republic of Korea		2,148.00						2,148.00
Commercial airfare							4,914.00				4,914.49
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Germany, January 26–30, 2006:											
Hon. Duncan Hunter	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/28	1/29	Iraq								
	1/29	1/30	Germany		137.00						137.00
Heath Bope	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/28	1/29	Iraq								
	1/29	1/30	Germany		137.00						137.00
Andrew Hunter	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/28	1/29	Iraq								
	1/29	1/30	Germany		137.00						137.00
Delegation Expenses	1/27	1/28	Kuwait				134.94		1,329.38		1,464.32
Visit to Germany With CODEL McCain, February 2–5, 2006:											
Hon. Joe Schwarz	2/3	2/5	Germany		127.00						127.00
Hon. Ellen Tauscher	2/3	2/5	Germany		348.00						348.00
Hon. Mark Udall	2/3	2/5	Germany		348.00						348.00
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, February 14–20, 2006:											
Alexis Lasselle	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		356.00						356.00
	2/16	2/17	Iraq								
	2/17	2/20	Kuwait		1,068.00						1,068.00
Commercial airfare							7,495.17				7,495.17
Paul Arcangeli	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		356.00						356.00
	2/16	2/17	Iraq								
	2/17	2/20	Kuwait		1,068.00						1,068.00
Commercial airfare							7,495.17				7,495.17
Jesse Tolleson	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		356.00						356.00
	2/16	2/17	Iraq								
	2/17	2/20	Kuwait		1,068.00						1,068.00
Commercial airfare							7,475.17				7,475.17
Delegation Expenses	2/14	2/20	Kuwait				11.96		38.01		49.97
Visit to Taiwan, February 18–23, 2006:											
Hon. Rob Simmons	2/20	2/22	Taiwan		690.00						690.00
Commercial airfare							5,063.86				5,063.86
Delegation Expenses	2/20	2/22	Taiwan						516.28		516.28
Visit to South Korea, Japan, China, March 21–27, 2006:											
Hon. Roscoe Bartlett	3/23	3/24	Japan		319.00						319.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Gene Taylor	3/24	3/25	South Korea		295.00						295.00
	3/25	3/25	China								
	3/23	3/24	Japan		319.00						319.00
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	3/24	3/25	South Korea		295.00						295.00
	3/25	3/25	China								
	3/23	3/24	Japan		319.00						319.00
Douglas Lane	3/24	3/25	South Korea		295.00						295.00
	3/25	3/25	China								
	3/23	3/24	Japan		319.00						319.00
Andrew Hunter	3/24	3/25	South Korea		295.00						295.00
	3/25	3/25	China								
	3/23	3/24	Japan		319.00						319.00
Visit to Bosnia, Italy, March 18–26, 2006: Hon. Loretta Sanchez	3/24	3/25	South Korea		295.00						295.00
	3/25	3/25	China								
	3/19	3/20	Bosnia		220.00						220.00
Commercial airfare	3/21	3/25	Italy		1,160.00						1,160.00
							8,072.92				8,072.92
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, Jordan, With CODEL McCain, March 23–27, 2006: Hon. Joe Schwarz	3/23	3/25	Kuwait		146.00						146.00
	3/25	3/26	Iraq								
	3/26	3/27	Jordan		269.00						269.00
Committee total					31,066.40		41,160.18		5,744.28		77,970.86

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DUNCAN HUNTER, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Harold Ford	1/6	1/8	Jordan, Iraq, Kuwait		758.00		3,638.48				4,396.48
	1/9	1/11	Pakistan, Afghanistan		716.00		2,275.74				2,991.74
Hon. Chris Chocola	1/9	1/12	Kuwait, Iraq		1,218.00		(?)				1,218.00
	1/12	1/13	Germany		137.00		(?)				137.00
Committee total					2,829.00		5,914.22				8,743.22

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

JIM NUSSLE, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Shimkus	3/17	3/20	Belarus		968.58		6,576.57		397.78		7,942.93
Committee total					968.58		6,576.57		397.78		7,942.93

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

—Apr. 11, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Cliff Stearns	1/17	1/19	Switzerland		356.00						356.00
	1/19	1/21	Poland		320.00						320.00
	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00						834.00
Hon. John Shadegg	1/24	1/26	Morocco		296.00						296.00
	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00		9,407.41				9,680.41
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						156.00
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						309.00
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						852.00
	1/1	1/3	Iraq		838.00		7,026.07				7,864.07
Hon. Tim Murphy	1/16	1/17	Ireland		692.00						692.00
	1/17	1/18	Northern Ireland		361.00						361.00
	1/18	1/19	England		542.00						542.00
Hon. Edward J. Markey	1/15	1/27	Switzerland		570.00		7,332.57		(190.00)		7,712.57
Hon. John Shimkus	3/17	3/20	Belarus		968.58		6,576.57		397.78		7,942.93
Committee total					7,367.58		30,342.62		207.78		37,917.98

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON, Chairman, May 5, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Michael G. Fitzpatrick	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00	(3)					304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00	(3)					788.00
	12/30	1/2	Pakistan		982.00	(3)					982.00
	1/2	1/3	Afghanistan		90.00	(3)					90.00
	1/3	1/4	Ireland		320.00	(3)					320.00
Hon. Jim Gerlach	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/22	1/23	Qatar		347.00	(3)					347.00
	1/24	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76		7,240.33				7,554.09
Hon. Barney Frank	1/25	1/30	Switzerland		1,681.00		6,368.64				8,049.64
Hon. Maxine Waters	3/20	3/20	Haiti				1,507.00				1,507.00
Committee total					5,231.76		15,115.97				20,347.73

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Stephen Lynch	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00		6,895.43				7,301.43
	1/22	1/23	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	1/24	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76						313.76
Hon. Todd Platts	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00		7,240.33				7,646.33
	1/22	1/23	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	1/24	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76						313.76
Hon. Christopher Shays	2/3	2/3	United Kingdom		440.00		3,328.00				3,768.00
	2/5	2/6	Israel		362.00						362.00
	2/6	2/7	Italy		363.00						363.00
Nick Palarino	2/3	2/3	United Kingdom		440.00		3,328.00				3,768.00
	2/5	2/6	Israel		362.00						362.00
	2/6	2/7	Italy		363.00						363.00
Jeff Baran	2/3	2/3	United Kingdom		440.00		3,328.00				3,768.00
	2/5	2/6	Israel		362.00						362.00
	2/6	2/7	Italy		363.00						363.00
James Kaiser	2/22	2/26	Columbia		650.00		1,067.00				1,717.00
Dennis Kilcoyne	2/22	2/26	Columbia		566.00		1,067.00				1,633.00
Hon. Darrell Issa	3/19	3/23	Brazil		506.00						506.00
	3/23	3/26	Argentina		318.00						318.00
Laurent Crenshaw	3/19	3/23	Brazil		506.00						506.00
	3/23	3/26	Argentina		318.00						318.00
Hon. Mark Souder	2/22	2/26	Colombia		936.00		2,761.00				3,697.00
Hon. William Lacy Clay	3/30	3/31	Jamaica		234.00						234.00
Marc Wheat	2/22	2/26	Colombia		936.00		1,067				2,003.00
Hon. Mark Souder	3/16	3/17	Jordan		186.00		7,400.49				7,586.49
	3/19	3/20	Qatar		347.00		1,067				347.00
	3/20	3/22	Pakistan		309.00						309.00
	3/22	3/24	Dubai		426.00						426.00
Committee total					11,866.52		37,482.25				49,348.77

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM DAVIS, Chairman, Apr. 25, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter T. King	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,141.00		(3)				2,249.00
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00		(3)				
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00		(3)				
Hon. Mike Rogers	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,141.00		(3)				2,249.00
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00		(3)				
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00		(3)				
Hon. William Pascrel	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,141.00		(3)				2,249.00
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00		(3)				
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00		(3)				
Hon. Michael McCaul	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,141.00		(3)				2,249.00
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00		(3)				
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00		(3)				
Hon. Donna Christensen	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,141.00		(3)				2,249.00
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00		(3)				
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00		(3)				
Robert O'Connor	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,320.00		(4) 7,307.57				9,735.57
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00						
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00						
Thomas Finan	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,320.00		(4) 7,352.64				9,780.64
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00						
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00						
Margaret Peterlin	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,320.00		(4) 6,996.14				9,350.14
	1/11	1/13	Italy		1,034.00						
Hon. Sheila Jackson-Lee	3/30	3/31	Jamaica		273.00		(3)				273.00
Committee total					18,728.00		21,656.35				40,384.35

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.
⁴ Commercial air transportation.

PETER T. KING, Chairman, Apr. 18, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 31 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Round trip airfare	2/25	3/2					5,470.50				5,470.50
Don MacDonald	3/20	3/25	Morocco		1,490.00		6,024.32				7,514.32
	1/8	1/11	Austria		684.00						684.00
	1/11	1/14	France		1,169.00						1,169.00
Round trip airfare	1/8	1/14					7,263.23				7,263.23
Greg McCarthy	1/3	1/4	United Arab Emirates		382.37						382.37
	1/4	1/7	Afghanistan		120.00						120.00
	1/7	1/8	Qatar		283.59						283.59
	1/8	1/11	Belgium		664.00						664.00
Round trip airfare	1/3	1/11					8,625.31				8,625.31
James McCormick	3/19	3/23	China		873.00		9,281.18				10,154.18
Hon. Betty McCollum	1/2	1/4	Senegal		647.00						647.00
	1/4	1/6	Benin		130.00						130.00
	1/6	1/8	Sudan		41.00						41.00
	1/8	1/11	Uganda		1,092.00						1,092.00
	1/11	1/12	Ireland		729.00		(⁹)				729.00
Hon. Thaddeus McCotter	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/29	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/29	12/30	Iraq								
	12/30	12/31	Pakistan		804.00						804.00
	12/31	1/2	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/2	1/3	Pakistan		178.00		(⁹)				178.00
Mary McDermott Noonan	2/20	2/21	Ireland		332.00						332.00
	2/21	2/23	United Kingdom		582.00						582.00
Round trip airfare	2/20	2/23					5,377.30				5,377.30
John Mackey	1/9	1/13	Argentina		912.00		4,150.50				5,062.50
	1/16	1/21	Colombia		1,220.00						1,220.00
	1/21	1/24	Ecuador		618.00						618.00
Round trip airfare	1/16	1/24					1,848.15				1,848.15
	3/20	3/22	El Salvador		382.00		1,329.00				1,711.00
	3/26	3/28	Colombia		500.00		1,587.81				2,087.81
Alan Makovsky	1/1	1/2	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
	1/2	1/5	Morocco		444.00						444.00
	1/5	1/9	Libya		1,576.00						1,576.00
	1/9	1/10	Germany		308.00						308.00
	1/9	1/13	Israel		1,448.00						1,448.00
Round trip airfare	1/1	1/13					8,055.00				8,055.00
Pearl-Alice Marsh	3/19	3/23	Belgium		1,117.00		3,165.00				4,282.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	3/30	3/31	Jamaica		143.00		(⁹)				143.00
Richard Mereu	2/20	2/21	Ireland		397.00						397.00
	2/21	2/23	United Kingdom		595.50						595.50
Round trip airfare	2/20	2/23					5,445.35				5,445.35
Carol Migdalovitz	3/20	3/25	Morocco		1,490.00		6,024.32				7,514.32
Francis Miko	1/23	1/27	Lebanon		468.00						468.00
	1/27	1/28	France		453.00						453.00
Round trip airfare	1/23	1/28					6,913.69				6,913.69
	2/24	2/26	United Arab Emirates		426.00						426.00
	2/26	3/2	Afghanistan		360.00						360.00
Round trip airfare	2/24	3/2					7,917.44				7,917.44
	3/20	3/25	Morocco		1,490.00		6,024.32				7,514.32
Paul Oostburg Sanz	1/10	1/13	Argentina		520.00		8,947.50				9,467.50
	1/25	1/27	Bolivia		218.00		2,360.00				2,578.00
	2/5	2/8	Haiti		236.00		1,027.00				1,263.00
Hon. Donald Payne	2/19	2/20	Kenya		280.00		4,114.25				4,394.25
Alfred Prados	1/23	1/27	Lebanon		468.00						468.00
	1/27	1/28	France		453.00						453.00
Round trip airfare	1/23	1/28					6,839.39				6,839.39
Beverly Razon	1/22	1/26	Belgium		1,274.00		6,512.90				7,786.90
Sheri Rickert	1/4	1/8	Uganda		109.00		1,416.00		8,821.00		9,237.00
	2/20	2/22	Ethiopia		109.00						109.00
	2/22	2/25	Ghana		435.00						435.00
Round trip airfare	2/20	2/25					8,592.00				8,592.00
Gregg Rickman	1/3	1/4	United Arab Emirates		382.37						382.37
	1/4	1/7	Afghanistan		120.00				4162.00		282.00
	1/7	1/8	Qatar		283.59				4162.00		282.00
	1/8	1/11	Belgium		664.00						664.00
Round trip airfare	1/3	1/11					8,625.31				8,625.31
William Robinson	3/19	3/25	Georgia		1,560.00		7,937.18				9,497.18
Robin Roizman	2/18	2/21	India		878.00						878.00
	2/21	2/23	Bangladesh		393.50						393.50
Round trip airfare	2/18	2/21					8,934.28				8,934.28
Hon. Illeana Ros-Lehtinen	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00				41,964.28		2,370.28
	1/21	1/23	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	1/23	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76		(⁹)				313.76
Hon. Adam Schiff	2/19	2/23	Indonesia		532.61		(⁹)				532.61
Thomas Sheehy	1/8	1/11	Austria		804.00						804.00
	1/11	1/14	France		1,209.00						1,209.00
Round trip airfare	1/8	1/14					7,243.23				7,243.23
Gregory Simpkins	1/4	1/8	Uganda		1,416.00		7,821.00				9,237.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	1/4	1/8	Uganda		1,416.00		7,821.00				9,237.00
Cliff Stammerman	1/3	1/4	United Arab Emirates		382.37						382.37
	1/4	1/7	Afghanistan		120.00						120.00
Round trip airfare	1/3	1/8					8,319.22				8,319.22
Sam Stratman	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/21	1/23	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	1/23	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76		(⁹)				313.76
William Tucherello	2/20	2/21	Indonesia		157.93		(⁹)				157.93
	2/21	1/25	East Timor		273.43						273.43
Mark Walker	1/8	1/10	Guatemala		502.00						502.00
	1/10	1/12	Costa Rica		442.00						442.00
	1/12	1/13	Panama		236.00						236.00
Round trip airfare	1/8	1/13					2,072.84				2,072.84
	1/25	1/27	Bolivia		236.00		3,089.00				3,325.00
Hon. Diane Watson	3/30	3/31	Jamaica		143.00		(⁹)				143.00
Hon. Robert Wexler	1/9	1/11	Romania		1,668.00		7,308.59				8,976.59
	2/22	2/23	Austria		318.00						318.00
	2/23	2/24	Belgium		382.00						382.00
Round trip airfare	2/22	2/24					5,710.15				5,710.15
	3/22	3/23	Netherlands		147.14		6,245.28				6,392.42
Hillel Weinberg	1/22	1/26	Belgium		1,460.00						1,460.00
	1/26	1/28	Finland		530.00						530.00
	1/28	1/31	Mali		525.00						525.00
Round trip airfare	1/22	1/31					12,467.06				12,467.06
	2/25	2/28	Japan		1,074.00						1,074.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 31 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Peter Yeo	1/5	1/6	Singapore		210.00						210.00
	1/6	1/8	Indonesia		1,091.00						1,091.00
Round trip airfare	1/5	1/8					7,274.00				7,274.00
Matthew Zweig	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/21	1/23	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	1/23	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76		(³)				313.76
Committee total					112,177.83		422,793.29		15,154.72		550,125.84

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.
⁴ Delegation costs.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.	1/7	1/10	Poland		1,008.00		2,875.00				3,883.00
	1/10	1/12	Lithuania				385.16				385.16
	1/12	1/13	Lithuania		510.00		514.00				1,024.00
	1/12	1/13	Amsterdam		378.00		4,217.27				4,595.27
Philip Kiko	1/7	1/10	Poland		1,008.00		2,875.00		1,049.00		4,932.00
			Lithuania				385.16				385.16
	1/10	1/12	Lithuania		510.00		514.01		447.54		1,471.55
	1/12	1/13	Amsterdam		378.00		4,217.27				4,595.27
Committee total					3,792.00		15,982.87		1,496.54		21,271.41

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Chairman, Apr. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
No 1st quarter travel											
Committee total											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICHARD POMBO, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MARCH 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Phil Gingrey	3/9	3/11	Kuwait		406.00		(³)				406.00
	3/11	3/12	UAE		519.00		(³)				519.00
	3/12	3/13	Germany		304.00		(³)				304.00
Committee total					1,229.00						1,229.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

DAVID DRIER, Chairman, May 1, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Wu	11/26	12/3	China						8,434.44		8,434.44
Committee total									8,434.44		8,434.44

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

—Mar. 20, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Roscoe Bartlett	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Ben Chandler	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Bud Cramer	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Jim Costa	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Lincoln Davis	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Phil Gingrey	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Darlene Hooley	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Bob Inglis	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Brad Miller	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Chuck Atkins	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Amy Carroll	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		1,668.80		(3)				1,668.80
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Tim Clancy	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Elizabeth Grossman	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
John Konkus	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		1,668.80		(3)				1,668.80
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Committee total					18,216.80						18,216.80

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

—, Apr. 5, 2006.

(ADDENDUM) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Johannes Loschn	3/28	4/2	Russia		563.00		5,288.40		1,225.59		7,076.99
Kaitlyn O'Hara	3/28	4/2	Russia		563.00		5,308.40		1,272.87		7,144.27
Committee total					1,126.00		10,576.80		2,498.46		14,221.26

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Nathan Berkeley	1/4	1/12	Japan				9,210.75	522.00	2,248.00		11,458.75
Bradley Knox	1/1	1/12	Japan				9,210.75	522.00	2,248.00		11,458.75
Hon. Donald Manzullo	1/1	1/12	Japan				9,210.75	522.00	2,248.00		11,458.75
Rich Beutel	2/19	2/22	China				6,798.19		873.00		7,671.19
Committee total							34,430.44		7,617.00		42,047.44

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Chairman, Apr. 24, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jerrold Nadler	1/16	1/16	Guantanamo Bay				(3)				
Hon. John Duncan	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. Jim Oberstar	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. E. B. Johnson	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. Henry Brown	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. John Boozmam	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Fraser Verrusio	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
John Cullather	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Jim Coon	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Jim Tymon	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Stephanie Manning	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Geoff Bowman	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. John Duncan	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Hon. Jim Oberstar	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Hon. E. B. Johnson	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Hon. Henry Brown	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Hon. John Boozmam	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Fraser Verrusio	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
John Cullather	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Jim Coon	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Jim Tymon	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Stephanie Manning	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Geoff Bowman	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Committee total					16,560.00		(3)				16,560.00
Hon. John Duncan	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. Jim Oberstar	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. E.B. Johnson	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. Henry Brown	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. John Boozmam	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Fraser Verrusio	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
John Cullather	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Jim Coon	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Jim Tymon	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Stephanie Manning	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Geoff Bowman	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. John Duncan	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Jim Oberstar	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. E.B. Johnson	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Henry Brown	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. John Boozmam	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Fraser Verrusio	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
John Cullather	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Jim Coon	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Jim Tymon	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Stephanie Manning	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Geoff Bowman	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Kenny Marchant	2/17	2/21	France		1,812.00		(3)				1,812.00
	2/21	2/21	Belgium				(3)				
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
Committee total					20,292.00						20,292.00
Lloyd Jones	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Elizabeth Megginson	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Fraser Verrusio	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
John Anderson	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Ken Kopocis	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Geoff Bowman	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Ryan Seiger	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Lloyd Jones	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom		880.00						880.00
Elizabeth Megginson	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom		880.00						880.00
Fraser Verrusio	3/21	3/26	United Kingdom		1,760.00						1,760.00
John Anderson	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom	880.00							880.00
Ken Kopocis	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom	880.00							880.00
Geoff Bowman	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom	880.00							880.00
Ryan Seiger	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom	880.00							880.00
Lloyd Jones	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,621.00							1,621.00
Elizabeth Megginson	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,044.00							1,044.00
John Anderson	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,621.00							1,621.00
Ken Kopocis	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,621.00							1,621.00
Geoff Bowman	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,621.00							1,621.00
Ryan Seiger	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,621.00							1,621.00
Committee total					24,400.00		54,338.24				78,738.24
Grand committee total					61,252.00		54,338.24				115,590.24

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
 (3) Military air transportation.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

STEVE BUYER, Chairman, April 7, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Phil English	3/19	3/23	Brazil		840.00		(3)				840.00
Hon. Phil English	3/23	3/26	Argentina		684.00		(3)				683.00
Hon. Mark Foley	3/20	3/20	Haiti		840.00		701.00				701.00
Committee total					1,524.00		701.00				2,225.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, May 4, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Elizabeth Larson	10/02	10/05	Europe	1,380.00							
Commercial airfare							7,254.48				8,634.48
Michael Delaney	10/02	10/07	Europe	2,188.00							
Commercial airfare							8,354.20				10,542.20
Kelly Gaffney	10/02	10/07	Europe	2,188.00							
Commercial airfare							8,354.20				10,542.20
Michele Lang	10/02	10/07	Europe	2,188.00							
Commercial airfare							8,354.20				10,542.20
Michael Ennis	10/10	10/13	Europe	676.00							
Commercial airfare	10/14	10/16	Europe	938.00							
Kim Knur	10/10	10/13	Europe	676.00							
Commercial airfare	10/14	10/16		938.00			5,332.91				6,946.91
Jacob Abel	10/10	10/13		676.00							
Commercial airfare	10/14	10/16		938.00			5,332.91				6,946.91
Hon. John Tierney	11/26	11/28	Europe	880.00							
Commercial airfare	11/28	11/30	Europe	756.00			7,823.90				9,459.90
Larry Hanauer	11/26	11/28	Europe	880.00							
Commercial airfare	11/28	11/30	Europe	756.00			7,823.90				9,459.90
Wyndee Parker	10/29	10/31	Middle East	633.00							
Commercial airfare	10/31	11/01	Middle East	536.00							
							9,019.15				10,188.15
	10/03	10/04		176.00							
Commercial airfare	10/05	10/07		417.00			5,555.70				6,148.70
Hon. Michael Rogers	11/27	11/29	Middle East	234.00							
	11/30	12/01	Middle East	280.00							
Military airfare	12/02	12/03	Middle East	762.00							1,276.00
Hon. Rick Renzi	11/27	11/29	Middle East	234.00							
	11/30	12/01	Middle East	280.00							
Military airfare	12/02	12/03	Middle East	762.00							1,276.00
Kathleen Reilly	11/27	11/29	Middle East	234.00							
	11/30	12/01	Middle East	280.00							
Military airfare	12/02	12/03	Middle East	762.00							1,276.00
Robert Myhill	11/27	11/29	Middle East	234.00							
	11/30	12/01	Middle East	280.00							
Military airfare	12/02	12/03	Middle East	762.00							1,276.00
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	10/09	10/10	Hati	284.00							284.00
David Abruzzino	10/09	10/10	Hati	284.00							284.00
Commercial airfare											
Committee total											102,030.46

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
John Stophor	1/17	1/19	Asia		464.00						
	1/19	1/22	Asia		636.00						
	1/22	1/25	Asia		842.00						
	1/26	1/27	Asia		125.00						
Commercial airfare							7,688.00				9,755.00
Michael Ennis	1/17	1/19	Asia		464.00						
	1/19	1/22	Asia		636.00						
	1/22	1/25	Asia		842.00						
	1/26	1/27	Asia		125.00						
Commercial airfare							7,688.00				9,755.00
Wyndee Parker	1/17	1/19	Asia		464.00						
	1/19	1/22	Asia		636.00						
	1/22	1/25	Asia		746.85						
	1/26	1/27	Asia		125.00						
Commercial airfare							7,565.00				9,632.00
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	1/10	1/11	Europe		358.00						

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		142.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							9,432.65				11,367.68
Hon. John McHugh	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							9,432.65				11,367.68
Hon. Rush Holt	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							9,432.65				11,367.68
Hon. Jane Harman	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
Commercial airfare							7,998.00				9,433.03
Hon. Jane Harman	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
Commercial airfare							7,138.50				8,573.53
Michael Meermans	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							6,001.93				8,036.96
Jamal Ware	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							6,001.93				8,036.96
Michele Lang	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							6,021.93				8,036.96
Committee total											93,994.80
Kelly Gaffney	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							7,545.93				9,580.96
Jacob Abel	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							6,021.93				8,056.96
Katrina Gammon	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							6,021.93				8,056.96
David Buckley	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							7,138.50				9,173.53
Jeremy Bash	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
Commercial airfare							8,095.50				9,530.53
Hon. William Thornberry	1/9	1/13	Europe		537.00						
Commercial airfare							7,763.15				8,300.15
Riley Perdue	1/9	1/13	Europe		537.00						
Commercial airfare							7,763.15				8,300.15
Kerry Taylor	1/9	1/13	Europe		537.00						
Commercial airfare							7,763.15				8,300.15
Hon. Jane Harman	2/2	2/5	Europe		966.00						966.00
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	2/18	2/20	Asia		750.00						
	2/21	2/24	Australia		910.00						
Commercial airfare							10,644.36				12,304.36
Michael Ennis	2/18	2/20	Asia		750.00						
	2/21	2/24	Australia		910.00						
Commercial airfare							9,038.36				10,648.36
Jamal Ware	2/18	2/20	Asia		750.00						
	2/21	2/24	Australia		910.00						
Commercial airfare							12,508.36				14,168.36
Christopher Donesa	2/18	2/20	Asia		750.00						
	2/21	2/24	Australia		910.00						
Commercial airfare							9,038.36				10,698.35

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Riley Perdue	2/19	2/23	Europe		1,760.00						
Commercial airfare							7,233.43				8,993.43
Donald Stone	2/19	2/23	Europe		1,760.00						
Commercial airfare							7,233.43				8,993.43
James Lewis	2/07	2/09	Middle East		547.00						
Commercial airfare							6,090.39				6,637.39
Hon. Robert Crammer	3/15	3/22	Europe		2,220.00						
Commercial airfare							8,441.93				10,661.93
Michael Delaney	3/15	3/22	Europe		2,220.00						
Commercial airfare							8,386.93				10,606.93
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00						
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						
Commercial airfare							7,752.11				9,342.11
Hon. Todd Tiahrt	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00						
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						
Commercial airfare							7,764.84				9,354.84
Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00						
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						
Commercial airfare							7,622.41				9,212.41
James Lewis	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00						
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						
Commercial airfare							7,602.41				9,192.41
David Buckley	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00						
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						
Commercial airfare							8,367.24				9,957.24
Wyndee Parker	3/22	3/23	Europe		403.00						
Commercial airfare	3/23	3/25	Europe		408.00						
							6,768.37				7,579.37
Committee total											393,561.11

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

PETER HOEKSTRA, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Chairman, Apr. 3, 2006.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8191. A letter from the Directors, Congressional Budget Office and Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a joint report on the technical assumptions to be used in preparing estimates of National Defense Function (050) fiscal year 2006 outlay rates and prior year outlays, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 226(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8192. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8193. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8194. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of De-

fense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8195. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisitions, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report presenting the specific amounts of staff-years of technical effort to be allocated for each Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC) during Fiscal Year 2007, pursuant to Public Law 109-148, section 8026(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8196. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report as of March 31, 2006, entitled, "Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects and activities; Defense Cooperation Account," pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8197. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisitions, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report required by Section 812 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, Pub. L. 108-136, entitled, "Foreign Sources of Supply: Assessment of

the United States Defense Industrial Base for Fiscal Year 2005"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8198. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's STARBASE Program 2005 Annual Report, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2193b(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8199. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisitions, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of acquisitions made by the Department from entities that manufacture the articles, materials, or supplies outside the United States in Fiscal Year 2005, pursuant to Public Law 108-447, section 641; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8200. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's intention to close the Defense commissary store at Bad Kissingen (Daley Village Army housing area) by July 14, 2006; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8201. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration,

Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Class Exemption for Services Provided in Connection With the Termination of Abandoned Individual Account Plans [ZRIN 1210-ZA05; Prohibited Transaction Exemption 2006-06; Application No. D-11201] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8202. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Coupeville and Sequim, Washington) [MB Docket No. 04-280; RM-11037; RM-11117] received April 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8203. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8204. A letter from the Deputy Solicitor for National Operations, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of the Department of Labor Freedom of Information Act Regulations and Implementation of Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996; Final Rule (RIN: 1290-AA17) received May 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8205. A letter from the Secretary for Regulatory Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Individuals and Groups Considered to Have Performed Active Military, Naval, or Air Service (RIN: 2900-AM39) received May 18, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8206. A letter from the Office of Regulatory Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Remarriage of a Surviving Spouse (RIN: 2900-AM24) received May 18, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8207. A letter from the Office of Regulatory Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amended Delegation of Authority—Property Management Contractor (RIN: 2900-AM38) received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8208. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Extension of the Expiration Date for the Digestive Listings (RIN: 0960-AG39) received May 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8209. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medicare Program; Requirements for Providers and Suppliers to Establish and Maintain Medicare Enrollment [CMS-6002-F] (RIN: 0938-AH73) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 885. Resolution

providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5638) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified credit against the estate tax to an exclusion equivalent of \$5,000,000 and to repeal the sunset provision for the estate and generation-skipping taxes, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-517). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PUTNAM: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 886. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4890) to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority (Rept. 109-518). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 5655. A bill to eliminate the annual numerical limitation on the number of aliens who may be provided status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HALL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 5656. A bill to provide for Federal energy research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 5657. A bill to promote preventive health care for Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GORDON:

H.R. 5658. A bill to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. GORDON:

H.R. 5659. A bill to provide for the demonstration and commercial application of innovative energy technologies derived from federally-sponsored research and development programs, by incorporating those technologies into Federal buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. JINDAL):

H.R. 5660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand the benefits for businesses operating in empowerment zones, enterprise communities, or renewal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 5661. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the unauthorized removal or use of personal information contained in a database owned, operated, or maintained by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide individuals a deduction for certain mass public transportation expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 5663. A bill to penalize States that prohibit oil and gas exploration within their borders by denying them the use of any oil or natural gas produced domestically elsewhere; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 5664. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 Cooper Street in Babylon, New York, as the "Jacob Fletcher Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 5665. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and improvements of the Gooding Division of the Minidoka Project, Idaho; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 5666. A bill to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the A & B Irrigation District in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 5667. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of discretionary budget authority, promote fiscal responsibility, reinstate Pay-As-You-Go rules, require responsible use of reconciliation procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Standards of Official Conduct, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE (for herself and Mr. RUSH):

H. Con. Res. 431. Concurrent resolution calling on the President to proclaim 2007 as the "National Year of the Bible"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Res. 882. A resolution honoring Dr. Carolyn R. Wilder, Professor of Child Development at West Los Angeles College in Los Angeles, California, in recognition of her retirement after 32 years of service to the College; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H. Res. 883. A resolution urging every Representative Member, officer, and employee of the House of Representatives to read, ponder, and reflect upon the principles of the United States Constitution on Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. OSBORNE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr.

LUCAS, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 884. A resolution honoring the town of Nicodemus, Kansas, for its contribution to American history; to the Committee on Resources.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. RANGEL introduced a bill (H.R. 5668) for the relief of Amadou Heinz Ly; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 550: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 653: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 910: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 952: Mr. CARDIN.
 H.R. 1182: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1298: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 1384: Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 1413: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 1449: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 1589: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 1603: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 1689: Mr. BARROW.
 H.R. 2103: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2134: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 2512: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3413: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
 H.R. 3427: Mr. INSLEE and Ms. HART.
 H.R. 3628: Mr. CARDIN.
 H.R. 3762: Mr. RAMSTAD.
 H.R. 4023: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. POMEROY, and Ms. HOOLEY.
 H.R. 4188: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 4416: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 4465: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 4494: Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 4597: Mr. BOREN and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H.R. 4710: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 4725: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FRANKS of Ari-

zona, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 4761: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 4843: Mr. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 4927: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. McGovern.
 H.R. 4960: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 4962: Mr. REYNOLDS and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H.R. 5013: Mr. POMBO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 5022: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 5092: Mr. FORBES, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 5146: Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 5150: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 5159: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 5225: Mr. NEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 5230: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H.R. 5250: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 5262: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 5290: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 5322: Mr. FEENEY and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 5337: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 5344: Ms. HERSETH.
 H.R. 5356: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
 H.R. 5358: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
 H.R. 5372: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 5424: Mr. LEACH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 5453: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 5455: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 5467: Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 5474: Mr. MCCRERY.
 H.R. 5478: Mr. UPTON and Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 5507: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 5513: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 5520: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 5538: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
 H.R. 5551: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 5560: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 5578: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 5588: Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 5604: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 5615: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 5624: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 5633: Mr. GILCREST.
 H.R. 5637: Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 5638: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. HART, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. SHAW.
 H.R. 5640: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Ms. HART.
 H.R. 5644: Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 5652: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.J. Res. 55: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 416: Mr. HAYES, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HEFLEY.
 H. Res. 790: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BOYD.
 H. Res. 820: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H. Res. 846: Mr. SERRANO.
 H. Res. 852: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H. Res. 854: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. SHAYS.
 H. Res. 860: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PENCE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H. Res. 881: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BARROW, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WU, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. STARK, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. SPRATT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4755: Mr. MCKEON.